CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

TUESDAY, JULY 17, 1951

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:30 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room F-39, the Capitol, Hon. Kenneth McKellar (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators McKellar, Hayden, McClellan, Robertson, Young, Knowland, Ecton, Stennis, and Cain.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS, NEW YORK

GENERAL STATEMENT BY SENATORS IVES AND LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK

Chairman MCKELLAR. The subcommittee will come to order.

Senator IVES. Mr. Chairman, both Senator Lehman and myself appreciate the way your committee has gone out of its way to have this hearing so that these particular projects in New York State, which are being supported by Senator Lehman and myself, may be considered. We believe these projects are important, we believe they are vital, and we believe they are essential; and we are very grateful to you for your consideration of our views.

A list of those who are to appear on the projects has been submitted to your committee. I think if you will follow that substantially the facts will be brought out.

I want to thank you again for your consideration.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Would you like to be heard on these?

Senator IVES. I do not desire to be heard at all. The various Congressmen are here and the people from the localities are going to be heard. I realize that with the limitation on time probably not more than 10 minutes on each project may be allowed, and I think they can better handle it themselves.

Senator LEHMAN. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the senior Senator from New York. I am very grateful to you and the members of your committee for the opportunity you are giving the various representatives.

I have a brief memorandum describing some of these projects, but because of the limitation of time, if it is agreeable, I will ask merely that it be inserted in the record.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Without objection, that may be done.

85787—51——41

(The memorandum referred to is as follows:)

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT ON NEW YORK PROJECTS BEFORE THE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to be here this morning with my colleague, Senator Ives, and with many other Members of Congress and distinguished officials and citizens of my State. I understand that this subcommittee is going to hold hearings on a number of engineering projects for various sections of New York State.

Concerning some of these projects I have personal and rather detailed knowledge. Some of them I have not had an opportunity to study. I am sure that the members of this committee and of the full Appropriations Committee will give these projects their careful and sympathetic consideration.

I know the problem that this committee faces and that the Congress faces—the problem of providing for the general welfare and the national defense and at the same time of restricting our expenditures to the minimum.

The citizens and officers of my State who are here, and some who are not here, have worked very hard to bring these projects and proposals into shape where they can be considered by this committee.

The Corps of Engineers has worked hard at preparing the basic data which will be submitted to you in one form or another in connection with these proposals.

I only wish this morning at this point in the proceedings to urge, in my capacity as Senator from New York, that you give these gentlemen who have come here from New York and the Members of the lower House who are here a careful and sympathetic hearing. I know you will do so, even without my asking.

I just want to say in passing that some of these projects—Jones Inlet, Fire Island, and Wellsville and Monkey Run—to name just four with which I am personally familiar, are, in my judgment, of vital importance for the defense of this country. They are important in the sense that a failure to carry out these projects would leave us, should we get involved in a major conflict, under heavy and intolerable handicaps in the carrying out of our defense effort.

Take Fire Island Inlet for example. I know that Congressman Greenwood, among others, has worked long and hard in support of this undertaking. He has communicated many times with me and with the Corps of Engineers in behalf of this undertaking. So did many of the other officials and citizens of Long Island.

The same is true of the flood-control project for the city of Wellsville, the Monkey Run project at Corning and other flood-control projects. Failure to carry these projects out might result in the recurrence of the tragic flood conditions that have obtained in the past, and would constitute a terrible blow to the vital defense activities carried on in those areas. The same is true of Jones Inlet.

I have mentioned these projects, not to be exclusive of the others, but because I personally know more about them. While I do not know as much about some of the others, they are undoubtedly very important. I know you will go into all these matters very carefully and weigh the defense implications and the other interests of our country.

Although none of the members of this subcommittee are from New York, or indeed, from any adjacent area, I know that you realize that New York State is one of the most vital areas in the Nation for the defense of this country and for the great productive effort which we are now putting forth. It is on this basis that I urge your careful study of the projects now before you and your kind attention to the views of the gentlemen who are going to appear.

Senator LEHMAN. I again want to express my appreciation and those of my constituents.

Senator IVES. I have a memorandum I would like to submit later on in the record on the Monkey Run Creek project at the appropriate place.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Without objection, that may be done.

Will one of you gentlemen introduce the first witness?

Senator IVES. I think the Jones Inlet project might be the first one you would want to undertake, Mr. Chairman. Congressman Hall is here and other representatives of that area.

JONES INLET PROJECT, NEW YORK

STATEMENT OF HON. LEONARD W. HALL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

LOCAL-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS, TOTAL ESTIMATED COST

Representative HALL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to express our gratitude for allowing us to come before you again.

May I say this? We were before you last year and your committee put in the Senate bill an item of $500,000 for this particular project. The history of it is simply this: It was recommended by the Chief of Engineers in 1941. It was adopted and put in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1945. The cost of the project is $2,420,000. The self-help amounts to $1,210,000 of that, the Federal Government to pay the other half, $1,210,000.

The reason why we are pressing this again this year is because this is really a two-pronged affair.

I think it might be better to let you look at this map.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Could you put it up there for the committee to see it?

Representative HALL. I do not know whether you can see it. I do not know whether it is large enough, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCKELLAR. All right. We will pass it around.

PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Representative HALL. If you will look at the map, on your left, starting with 1929, you can see the inlet here and this community of Point Lookout had 2,000 feet of land in front of it. That is a community of about $10 million or such valuation, with a population of about 5,000 people. As we progressed in 1934, you can see that the land was gradually being eroded from the front of Point Lookout and the inlet is being built up with a sand bar so that it is becoming increasingly dangerous. In 1950 you can see Point Lookout, this community of 5,000 people, has no more than 50 feet of land in front of it. It is only being held at 50 feet because the town authorities have in the past few years spent $350,000 to put up a temporary stone wall in front of the community. Our local engineers tell us that any real storm, any hurricane, would lift that out and that community of 5,000 souls would disappear into the ocean.

Senator KNOWLAND. What is the proposal, to make it concrete?

Representative HALL. The proposal of the engineers is to build a jetty over here. They say that will stop the erosion on that side.

Chairman MCKELLAR. It is authorized?

Representative HALL. It is authorized and approved.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Has the budget approved it?

Representative HALL. The budget has not approved it. It has been recommended each year by the engineers but the budget has not approved it.

1951 APPROPRIATION

Chairman MCKELLAR. You say the Senate put it in last year?

Representative HALL. The Senate put in an item of $500,000.

This is what I want to say that makes this project different from any others. The total cost is $2,420,000, of which the local authorities are to pay half. This is such a dangerous situation that representing the State of New York, the County of Nassau and the village of Freeport and the town of Hempstead, I can say to you today that the local authorities are willing to advance the whole sum of $2,420,000. They want to get this work done. Frankly, we know down here some of these projects are not approved because of the war situation. We are willing to advance the whole sum. We do not want any interest on the amount we will advance and we are willing to wait 1 year, 2 years or 5 years until the Congress appropriates for this type of project and then get back the advance we are willing to make now.

Chairman MCKELLAR. That is the first proposition of that kind I have ever heard made to the Government since I was a boy in Congress, and we got a railroad company to build a free bridge, free wagon wheel bridge, across the Mississippi River.

Representative HALL. Mr. Chairman, we will make it in the form of a promissory note.

That is our picture.

Chairman MCKELLAR. The Senate has already recommended it once?

Representative HALL. The Senate committee recommended it last year. As you will recall, right after your committee adopted this bill the Korean War came along and all these civil functions items were thrown into confusion.

Chairman MCKELLAR. We had a difference of opinion about some projects in the Southwest a year or two ago. I just want to know if there is any difference of opinion as to the necessity of building this project. Do you know of any?

Representative HALL. All I can say is this: I only know this project and every year we are spending more money just to hold that line in front of those houses. The question of necessity I think has been determined by everyone. We are wasting money because even though we build these stone walls there, they are only temporary and we would rather be paying that off as amortization on the main item and build that jetty right now. You can see there is no protection there at all.

May I finish by saying that 35,000 boats make the trip a year through that channel and I think the Coast Guard will tell you it is a very dangerous channel.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Let me ask the engineers what they have to say about this project.

NO BUDGET ESTIMATE ON PROJECT

Colonel POTTER. There is no budget estimate for the Jones Inlet project. As the Congressman has said, local interests have offered to

put up their share, which is half of the total cost of the project and in addition to advance funds for the Government's share. The Chief of Engineers does have authority to accept advances by local interests. However, it has been the policy of the Chief of Engineers for several years not to accept local advances for starting a new project because in effect that commits the Congress to future appropriation for the project.

Chairman McKellar. Another thing is that I do not think we ought to have a different rule for New York to lend us this money than for any other project. Do you not think that is wise?

Colonel Potter. We follow the same rule, sir, for all projects. After a project has been appropriated for by the Congress, no matter how small the amount, we take that as an indication that the Congress intends to finish the project and in that case we have at times accepted local advances to expedite the construction. That has been done in the past.

Senator McClellan. As I understand it, you do not accept these local-interest advances until Congress has appropriated enough at least to start the project?

Colonel Potter. That is correct, sir. No matter what the amount of the appropriation, as long as the Congress has indicated their willingness to start the project by appropriating funds for construction.

Senator McClellan. You accept it as an affirmative action in making the appropriation?

Chairman McKellar. The Congressman made a proposal that they would put up a lot of money.

Colonel Potter. If we did that, we would be binding the Congress to appropriate the money sometime in the future.

Representative Hall. However, if this committee put in language which would be an authorization to you, do you feel that the situation is so serious up there that you would go ahead?

Colonel Potter. I think it is a very important project and the potential loss of life is exceptionaly serious. The project is considered necessary and we feel that if the Congress would appropriate as little as $50,000 to start it, we could assume that Congress intends that the project be built.

Senator McClellan. You used the expression: "If this committee put in language which would be an authorization." This is not the committee that authorizes.

Representative Hall. I used the wrong word.

As I understand it—and you correct me if I am wrong—if certain language is used in the Appropriation Committee report, no appropriation made, but if the Army engineers can get any authority from language in the committee report, they will even go ahead because they think the matter is so serious. Do you agree with that?

Colonel Potter. I think that would be a matter of determination, sir. It would not be up to me to say.

Representative Hall. Mr. Chairman, in closing may I say that Mr. A. Holy Patterson, superintendent of the township of Hempstead, is here, and Mr. Sidney Shapiro, of the Long Island State Park Commission, and Mr. Robert Doxsee, mayor of the city of Freeport, and Judge Defalco of Point Lookout is here.

Senator Knowland. May I say this as a procedural matter, I notice there are four or five members of the House from the State of

New York here. They are all busy men with their committees. I thought perhaps as a courtesy to the Members of the House we might be able to hear them out of order and then in the record their testimony can go in the proper place.

Chairman McKellar. That is all right.

Representative Hall. Mr. Chairman, simply for the record I should like to include at this point the specific offer by the State of New York, the county of Nassau, and the township of Hempstead, to advance the Federal share of the cost covering this project.

(Letter referred to is as follows:)

LONG ISLAND STATE PARK COMMISSION,
COUNTY OF NASSAU,
Hempstead, July 9, 1951.

To the Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

GENTLEMEN: This is an appeal on behalf of the State of New York, the county of Nassau and the town of Hempstead, joined together in contributing $1,210,000 to match an equal amount of Federal funds for the purpose of stabilizing Jones Inlet on the south shore of Long Island in the New York metropolitan area. In addition to providing the local 50 percent of the cost of the project, these agencies are also prepared to advance the Federal share of the cost, to be repaid eventually by the Government. Consequently, the entire $2,420,000 is now available and construction contracts can be let immediately by the Army without further Federal aid at this time.

The history of Jones Inlet is best summarized in the attached presentation to your committee jointly submitted by United States Senators Irving M. Ives and Herbert H. Lehman; Representative Leonard W. Hall; Robert Moses, president of the Long Island State Park Commission; J. Russel Sprague, county executive for Nassau County; and A. Holly Patterson, presiding supervisor for the town of Hempstead, N. Y. In a word, over the past 10 years, the project was approved by the Army engineers and authorized by Congress, terminating in a recommendation for an appropriation of $500,000 voted by your Committee on Appropriations last year toward the Federal share of the project (Senate Calendar No. 1944, Rept. No. 1941). However, as you recall, when the rivers and harbors item was finally adopted by the Congress last summer, all projects were pooled with a stipulation that the total lump sum be drastically reduced. Unfortunately, Jones Inlet was caught in this squeeze.

There is no question as to the urgent necessity for the stabilization of Jones Inlet. Its record speaks for itself. The job is ready to go. All funds are available. Not a cent of Federal funds is necessary. All that is required is for this committee to indicate to the Army engineers that under existing legislation this project can go forward without further hesitation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT MOSES,
President, Long Island State Park Commission.
J. RUSSEL SPRAGUE,
County Executive, Nassau County.
A. HOLLY PATTERSON,
Presiding Supervisor, Town of Hempstead.

STATEMENT OF A. HOLLY PATTERSON, PRESIDING SUPERVISOR, TOWNSHIP OF HEMPSTEAD, NASSAU COUNTY, N. Y.

JONES INLET SEA WALL, NEW YORK

Mr. Patterson. Mr. Chairman, I desire to express our gratefulness to you and your committee for again giving us this opportunity to be heard. We were all tremendously gratified by the action of your committee last year, in approving an appropriation of $500,000, which would have initiated this project and under which the Army

would have accepted not only our share of $1,210,000 but also the offer of the balance of the Federal share; namely, $710,000.

URGENCY OF PROJECT PLEADED

Frankly, our backs are against the wall. I want most earnestly to tell you that there hasn't been a single, solitary bit of self-help that we have not attempted to apply. Jones Inlet, in its present condition, is not only holding back a sound improvement project of tremendous economic importance, but it is a potential scourge on the community of Point Lookout, which Congressman Hall has told you about.

Our county executive, J. Russel Sprague, in behalf of Nassau County and the township of Hempstead, which I represent, the village of Freeport, and other communities very directly affected, has left absolutely nothing undone through the years to get a correction of the situation at this inlet. I know of nothing that the county and township governments have left undone to get this project through.

Our people cannot understand the inaction that has taken place. I dislike to bring any element of drama into a matter of this kind but all of us who know the situation—and we have worked with it year after year—are terribly worried over the outlook if something is not done, and quickly, to get this project going. Backing the governmental authorities concerned are the people in our area who most earnestly and emphatically are demanding relief. The press in Nassau reflects local insistence that this job be done.

The very nature of our offer indicates the desperation of our plight and the lengths to which we are willing to go.

May I not earnestly urge that your committee renew the same recommendation you made to the Senate last year for an appropriation—whatever amount, large or small—which will be a directive to the Chief of Engineers to go ahead on this project and to accept our offer to advance the necessary funds?

STATEMENT OF ROBERT L. DOXSEE, MAYOR, FREEPORT, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

JONES INLET SEAWALL, NEW YORK

Mr. DOXSEE. Mr. Chairman, I can only renew the urgent representations and pleas that I made to you last year. The record is complete on the most important need for the initiation of this project. The Chief of Engineers is on record. The representative from his Office has emphasized the seriousness of this project and the catastrophe that, potentially, is staring us in the face. Every group that has had any association with this project has also urged the very serious need for it and that it should be undertaken.

As mayor of Freeport, the largest community contiguous to the inlet, I think I can assure your committee that you could make no sounder decision than to get this work going. As matters stand now it is only your committee that can throw us a lifebelt. We need it desperately.

STATEMENT OF SIDNEY SHAPIRO, REPRESENTING HON. ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT, LONG ISLAND STATE PARK COMMISSION, BABYLON, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

JONES INLET SEAWALL, NEW YORK

Mr. SHAPIRO. Mr. Chairman, I have been expressly delegated by Mr. Robert Moses, the president of the Long Island State Park Commission, to bring you his views on this project. He has asked me specifically to state that he knows of no more vital improvement than the stazilization of Jones Inlet and that from the viewpoint of the State of New York the improvement of this inlet is critically needed. He feels this is so not only from the standpoint of navigation but the potential loss of life that is inherent in the whole picture and, also as a protection to an investment of $30 million that the State of New York has made in the areas immediately contiguous to the point of the inlet.

STATEMENT BY OSBORNE A. McKEGNEY, ATTORNEY FOR POINT LOOKOUT CIVIC ASSOCIATION, POINT LOOKOUT, N. Y.

JONES INLET PROJECT, NEW YORK

Mr. MCKEGNEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to submit this memorandum on behalf of the residents and taxpayers of Point Lookout, N. Y., in support of proposed legislation appropriating funds to enable local authorities—State of New York, county of Nassau, and town of Hempstead—to proceed with the construction of a jetty and dredging contract for the stabilization of Jones Inlet.

The essential and vital necessity of immediate inauguration of this project is too well known to various committees of Congress, including Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, House Appropriations Committee, and Senate Civil Functions Committee, to require any lengthy explanation or repetition of known facts.

The matter has been the subject of various reports of the Army engineers since 1941. At the recent hearing held on July 17, 1951, the representative of the Army engineers stated the position of the Army to be that immediate inauguration of the project was vitally necessary and essential to protect loss of life and property. That necessary steps would be taken to permit such project to be inagurated immediately as soon as Congress enacts the necessary appropriation legislation.

Legislation authorizing the project with the Federal Government paying 50 percent of the cost has long since been enacted (1945). Appropriation of a portion of the Federal funds was adopted by the Senate Civil Functions Committee in 1950 at a hearing held last year in the sum of $500,000, but could not be processed to final conclusion because of the unfortunate outbreak of the Korean War.

The failure to enact legislation to appropriate funds for this project has resulted in the dangerous condition becoming so aggravated that at the present time further delay will result in irreparable damage and possible disaster and tragedy.

This legislation is essential to protect slightly less than 1,000 homes and real estate valued at approximately $10,000,000. The residents

and taxpayers are fearful lest the Kansas disaster be repeated in Point Lookout.

The navigational hazards have grown increasingly worse in the year that has passed since the Senate Civil Functions Committee authorized the first appropriation in 1950.

The threatened loss of life and property has become even more aggravated. The inroads of the ocean have been so great in the last year, and particularly in recent months, that at some points 100 feet of land have washed away. An owner was compelled only last week to build a bulkhead at a cost of many thousands of dollars to prevent his house from being washed out to the ocean, and other property owners are being similarly threatened.

Throughout the entire shore line of the unincorporated village of Point Lookout the ocean and its erosion is fast approaching a public street with threatened destruction of the public street and utilities—water, gas, electric light, and telephone—facing complete destruction in the very near future.

The local authorities have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars and will be compelled to constantly and repeatedly spend additional funds on mere temporary measures until such time as the stabilization project is completed. The emergency is so great that the local authorities, State, county, and town, have volunteered to pay the entire cost provided appropriate legislation can be enacted assuring them of the ultimate return of 50 percent from the Federal Government.

All that is required at the present time is a token appropriation by Congress of the sum of $500,000, or such lesser sum as will be acceptable to the Army engineers to warrant their inauguration of this project.

It is respectfully submitted and earnestly requested that this honorable committee protect navigational necessities, prevent navigational hazards, protect lives and property, and prevent the possible loss of an entire community by enacting legislation to appropriate funds to insure the inauguration of this vitally essential project.

STATEMENT OF HON. W. STERLING COLE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

WATKINS GLEN CREEK AND MONKEY RUN CREEK PROJECTS, CORNING, N. Y.

Senator IVES. Mr. Chairman, there are two projects which I think had better be handled by Congressman Cole. One is at Corning and the other at Watkins Glen. The first one is at Monkey Run Creek and the other one is at Watkins Glen Creek. Those happen to be in Congressman Cole's district.

Representative COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate my own appreciation for your time in hearing us. Unfortunately the comparable subcommittee on this problem over in the House is not as tolerant and understanding as you in the Senate are, and I am very grateful.

I will only take a moment to review the two projects collectively. Mr. Decker, who is president of the Corning Glass Works, will speak on the Monkey Run project, and Henry Valente, the attorney for the village of Watkins Glen, will speak on the Watkins Glen Creek project.

I would like to note the appearance of Mayor Erway of Watkins Glen.

MONKEY RUN PROJECT, N. Y.

The Monkey Run project was authorized by Congress in 1950, just a year ago. Funds have been appropriated for the preliminary plans, but because of the nature of the industry, which is principally benefited by this flood works, it is considered to be an emergency project in connection with the war production effort. Monkey Run is a hillside creek that flows down through the city of Corning, almost annually flooding the Corning Glass Works, causing the plant to shut down for periods of time with consequent suspension of the operation. Mr. Decker will describe that more fully.

WATKINS GLEN CREEK PROJECT, N. Y.

With respect to the Watkins Glen Creek project, that was authorized by the Congress in 1941. Initially the flood damage to that small rural area occurred in 1935 and there have been recurring floods there ever since.

Unfortunately this community is an orphan community so far as flood works go. It is not identified with any particular watershed. It is at the headwaters of the Oswego River. The waters that damage Watkins Glen flow into a large member of the Finger Lakes which eventually flows into a barge canal and eventually out in Lake Ontario through Oswego waters. The fact it is so isolated from the standpoint of flood protection it has been neglected for 15 years, and although there is no relationship between this project and war production, it does seem to me that this community has been patient long enough in waiting for some help from the Federal Government.

Mr. Valente will describe the damages that have occurred annually and the cost of repairing those.

Senator McClellan. Are there any local contributions provided in those two projects?

Representative Cole. I am not certain of that. I am sure there are either by the community or the State. These gentlemen will describe that to your satisfaction.

Senator Knowland. We have a number of other Congressmen here. Under the procedural arrangement I mentioned heretofore I wonder whether they want to make their presentations and then they can go on with the other witnesses. It might free the Congressmen to go back to the House.

Representative Cole. That is entirely up to you.

Senator Ives. Congressman Daniel A. Reed is here in the interest of the Wellsville project in Allegany County, N. Y.

STATEMENT OF HON. DANIEL A. REED, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

WELLSVILLE FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, NEW YORK

Representative Reed. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am here in behalf of a flood project for Wellsville, N. Y. It is a village in the Forty-fifth Congressional District located in Allegany

County, N. Y. The population is from 8,000 to 9,000. I have an authorization from the Civil Functions Committee for this project which amounts to about $609,000.

Chairman McKellar. What does the project do?

Representative Reed. The project is a flood-control project.

Chairman McKellar. It has nothing to do with power or navigation?

Representative Reed. Not at all. There are defense industries there, as I shall point out.

FLOODS IN PRIOR YEARS

In order to get the facts before you, I want to show you the damage suffered here in this village from time to time. I obtained this from the district engineer. In July 1942, the flood peak was 11.4 feet. The estimated damage was $210,000.

In May 1945, it was 10.2 feet and the estimated damage was $30,000.

In May 1946 is was 13.4 feet and the estimated damage was $250,000.

In April 1947 it was 9.4 feet and the estimated damage was $20,000.

In March 1948 it was 9.8 feet and the estimated damage was $30,000.

In March 1950 it was 12.1 feet and the estimated damage was $60,000.

In November 1950 it was 14.3 feet and the estimated damage was $400,000.

Chairman McKellar. What parts of your town are flooded?

Representative Reed. It goes through the central part of the town and also floods some defense industries which the mayor of the village and the attorney for the village will present to you later.

To bring this whole picture before you I think that I might read the letter of the district engineer.

Chairman McKellar. All right, sir.

Representative Reed. I wrote to Col. H. W. Schull, Jr., district engineer, United States Engineers Office, in Buffalo, N. Y., in the latter part of December 1950 and he replied very promptly. Here is what I wrote to him:

I shall appreciate it if you will furnish me with a complete report on the extent of the damage to the residential and industrial districts of Wellsville, N. Y., caused by the flood of November 25 and 26, 1950. I need this information for legislative purposes. I would also like to know to what extent did this flood damage potential war industries in said area. In addition, will you please let me know the severity and damage of this flood as compared with the floods incurred in 1942, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, and March of 1950?

Chairman McKellar. On what stream is this?

Representative Reed. It is part of the Genesee River. It is the Genesee River area.

Under date of January 4, 1951, Col. H. W. Schull, Jr., replied as follows to my letter:

Reference is made to your letter of December 27, in which you requested a report on the flood at Wellsville in November 1950 and a comparison between that flood and previous floods. The enclosed map shows the limits of the areas flooded in Wellsville in July 1942, May 1946, and November 1950. These three floods caused more damage than any others. In 1942 damage was confined principally to the Dyke Creek area.

I might say, not being able to get that appropriation the same year that the authorization was made, I asked for an emergency item

and obtained $20,000 from the Army engineers to go in the flood area in Wellsville, N. Y., and snag Dyke Creek.

Chairman McKellar. What do you mean by "snag"?

Representative Reed. All the old trees and debris that had fallen in and where the banks had fallen down and filled the bed of the stream so there was no free flow of water.

Chairman McKellar. Did it do any good?

Representative Reed. I will read what the engineer says in his letter:

Plants of Sinclair Refining Co., Air Preheater Co., and Julius Kayser Co. are in the flood area. The Bausch & Lomb plant on Pearl Street west of the Genesee River is not directly damaged by floods, but employees cannot get to work because it is surrounded by floodwaters. The municipal water and light plant is in the flood area.

When it is forced to shut down, the above industries and the Worthington Pump & Machinery Co., outside the flood area, are affected by loss of electric service. The Bausch & Lomb plant has only recently started operation, but all the others produced military supplies during World War II and all are potential suppliers.

Flooded areas along Broad, Miller, Hanover, Rauber, Cameron, Chamberlain, Stevens, and Brooklyn Streets are residential, and there are a few commercial establishments affected on South Main Street. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad is damaged frequently. Except for Island Park and the baseball field on the opposite side of Dyke Creek, the remainder of the flood area is undeveloped.

Flood damage begins at Wellsville when the river rises above 7.5 feet on the gage at the water and light plant. As a result of heavy rains, the river rose above this stage early in the afternoon of November 25, reached a peak about midnight, and then dropped below flood stage before noon on November 26. The peak was the highest on record.

The water and light plant was shut down from November 25 to 29. Power service was interrupted for only 1 hour, after which it was supplied from another source. Water pumps were out of service for 24 hours. During that time, the supply in storage fell below a normal day's usage and would have been inadequate for fire fighting.

Then he goes on in the letter and shows the different stages of the flood and the damage in each case. I read those.

Then he says:

Local officials consider that clearing and snagging work done in Wellsville in 1950 reduced the peak stage of the November flood. They understand that the work was not of sufficient scope to eliminate damage in a major flood.

That is from the district engineer at Buffalo who made the survey during the last part of last year and wrote to me the very first of this year, 1951.

AMOUNT FOR PLANNING FUNDS

Chairman McKellar. Has any planning money ever been given for this?

Representative Reed. No; that is exactly what we are asking for here. There were 34 projects in the House and this one at Wellsville, N. Y., received the largest vote of any 1 of the 34 projects, even though it was defeated.

Chairman McKellar. Colonel Potter, will you tell us what the attitude of the Corps of Engineers is on this project?

Colonel Potter. The Corps of Engineers asked for planning money from the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget approved planning funds in the amount of $34,500.

Chairman McKellar. When did they approve that?

Colonel POTTER. That is in the President's budget for fiscal year 1952.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Is that much in the budget now?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir; but the House allowed nothing.

Representative REED. That is the one which I said received the largest vote in the House.

Colonel POTTER. We recommended $20,000 for planning, but in reallocating the amount allowed by the budget for planning we made an allocation of $34,500.

Chairman MCKELLAR. That is the amount, and that is the amount you want, Congressman?

Representative REED. Of course, we always want more, but we will certainly accept that, and with great gratitude.

Chairman MCKELLAR. All right, go ahead.

Representative REED. I just want to say that it is not necessary to describe this beautiful village because it is one of the old-time villages, strictly an American community in which these defense plants are located. The sources of the streams that bring on these floodwaters are in the State of Pennsylvania. The timber is gradually being cut away, has been over a period of years, and that has increased the floods.

It may not be the usual practice, but I have prepared for each member of your committee a complete statement with a copy of the two speeches I made on this subject in the House. It is all attached here. Each one is addressed to the chairman, and one to each of you members, where you will have the record before you, and it can go in the permanent record.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Thank you very much.

(The material referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. DANIEL A. REED, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Civil Functions Committee: I am very grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, and to each member of this committee, for this opportunity to present facts in support of an appropriation for an authorized flood project in the Forty-fifth Congressional District, which district I have had the honor to represent for the past 33 years.

The project relates to the village of Wellsville, N. Y., which has a population of from 8,000 to 9,000, according to the recent census. In this flooded village area are important defense plants, as I shall point out later. There was heretofore duly authorized for the project $609,000. The Budget Bureau recommended a planning item for this project this year amounting to $34,500.

Under date of January 4, 1951, Col. H. W. Schull, Jr., United States district engineer at Buffalo, N. Y., at my request, furnished these peak flood stages at Wellsville, N. Y., from July 1942 to November 1950, inclusive:

Date	Peak flood stage	Estimated damages (adjusted to 1950 price levels)
	Feet	
July 1942	11.4	$210,000
May 1945	10.2	30,000
May 1946	13.4	250,000
April 1947	9.4	20,000
March 1948	9.8	30,000
March 1950	12.1	60,000
November 1950	14.3	400,000

I may say in this connection that under date of December 27, 1950, I wrote to Col. H. W. Schull, Jr., district engineer, United States Engineers Office, 960 Ellicott Square Building, Buffalo, N. Y., as follows:

"MY DEAR COLONEL SCHULL: I shall appreciate it if you will furnish me with a complete report on the extent of the damage to the residential and industrial districts of Wellsville, N. Y., caused by the flood of November 25 and 26, 1950. I need this information for legislative purposes. I would also like to know to what extent did this flood damage potential war industries in said area. In addition, will you please let me know the severity and damage of this flood as compared with the flood incurred in 1942, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, and March of 1950?"

Under date of January 4, 1951, Col. H. W. Schull, Jr., replied as follows to my letter of December 27, 1950:

"DEAR MR. REED: Reference is made to your letter of December 27, in which you requested a report on the flood at Wellsville in November 1950 and a comparison between that flood and previous floods. The enclosed map shows the limits of the areas flooded in Wellsville in July 1942, May 1946, and November 1950. These three floods caused more damage than any others. In 1942 damage was confined principally to the Dyke Creek area.

"Plants of Sinclair Refining Co., Air Preheater Co., and Julius Kayser Co. are in the flood area. The Bausch & Lomb plant on Pearl Street west of the Genesee River is not directly damaged by floods, but employees cannot get to work because it is surrounded by floodwaters. The municipal water and light plant is in the flood area.

"When it is forced to shut down the above industries and the Worthington Pump & Machinery Co., outside the flood area, are affected by loss of electric service. The Bausch & Lomb plant has only recently started operation, but all the others produced military supplies during World War II and all are potential suppliers.

Flooded areas along Broad, Miller, Hanover, Rauber, Cameron, Chamberlain, Stevens, and Brooklyn Streets are residential, and there are a few commercial establishments affected on South Main Street. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad is damaged frequently. Except for Island Park and the baseball field on the opposite side of Dyke Creek, the remainder of the flood area is undeveloped.

"Flood damage begins at Wellsville when the river rises above 7.5 feet on the gage at the water and light plant. As a result of heavy rains, the river rose above this stage early in the afternoon of November 25, reached a peak about midnight, and then dropped below flood stage before noon on November 26. The peak was the highest on record.

"The water and light plant was shut down from November 25 to 29. Power service was interrupted for only 1 hour, after which it was supplied from another source. Water pumps were out of service for 24 hours. During that time, the supply in storage fell below a normal day's usage and would have been inadequate for fire fighting.

"Spot interviews were made after the flood and compared with damage at the same points in previous floods. On this basis, the damage at Wellsville from the November 1950 flood is estimated at $400,000. Damage to industries because of lost production were low since only the refinery normally operates on week ends.

"The following table lists the peak stages at the water and light plant and estimated damages in the floods listed in your letter:

Date	Peak flood stage	Estimated damages (adjusted to 1950 price levels)
	Feet	
July 1942	11.4	$210,000
May 1945	10.2	30,000
May 1946	13.4	250,000
April 1947	9.4	20,000
March 1948	9.8	30,000
March 1950	12.1	60,000
November 1950	14.3	400,000

"Local officials consider that clearing and snagging work done in Wellsville in 1950 reduced the peak stage of the November flood. They understand that the work was not of sufficient scope to eliminate damage in a major flood.

"Very truly yours,

"H. W. SCHULL, Jr.,
"*Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer.*"

The authorization for the Wellsville, N. Y., flood project did not become law in time to permit me to get the appropriation; moreover, it is seldom that an appropriation is made for an authorization the same year. To provide against damage to Wellsville from a "flash" or sudden flood pending a future appropriation I sent under date of January 11, 1950, the following letter to Col. E. H. Forney, district engineer (at that time), Buffalo, N. Y.:

"DEAR COLONEL FORNEY: I have a flood-control project in my district, with reference to Dyke Creek at Wellsville, N. Y., which, of course, is part of Genesee River and its flood-control problem. The menace of recurring floods to the village of Wellsville is ever present and you may recall that I made application on November 3, 1948, to have Dyke Creek at Wellsville, N. Y., cleared under the authorization for emergency flood-control work.

"A request was submitted by Col. Herbert Vogel, then district engineer stationed at Buffalo, under date of November 18, 1948, for $20,000 for clearing and snagging in Dyke Creek and Genesee River, but funds appropriated for the purpose in the fiscal year 1949 had been exhausted before that time, I was so informed.

"I had an authorization for this entire project at Wellsville inserted in a bill which passed the House during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress but it did not pass the Senate. The bill is now pending in the Senate and I doubt if it will become law in time to enable me to procure the appropriation this year to carry out this work.

"In the meantime the people as well as the residential sections and schools and public buildings are in danger of spring floods and even flash flood in the coming summer. Therefore, I feel that I will be under very severe criticism on the part of the people of that village unless some effort is made under the authorization for emergency flood-control work to relieve this village pending the time when the authorization for this project becomes law and the appropriation procured.

"I want to say here and now that I appreciate the fine cooperation I have had from the Corps of Engineers and I do not intend to ask for anything that I do not think has real merit. I believe that if there is any place where this emergency fund could be made available, at the earliest practicable moment to convince the people that the Government is going to relieve them of this frequent damage of property by floods as well as the danger to the life and health of the community, I think it is this particular community—Wellsville.

"I have a letter dated Janury 25, 1949, from Col. Robert Vogel, the then district engineer at Buffalo, from which I quote:

"'After the next appropriation act has been passed, if you believe the urgency of the work is critical, this office will consider resubmission of the request.'

"I wish to state now that I firmly believe that the flood-control work to be performed at Wellsville is critical and in need of relief under the emergency act pending the time when the authorization becomes law and the appropriation has been made.

"Yours sincerely,

"(Signed) DANIEL A. REED.

Without going into further detail the following telegram is sufficient to show the fine cooperation I received from the Army engineers:

"Re your telegram September 27, 1950, clearing and snagging operation on Genesee River and Dyke Creek at Wellsville, N. Y., completed on September 22, 1950, included removing snags, debris, and shoals; widening channel where required, widening at bends and clearing under all bridges on Genesee River within limits of Wellsville, N. Y., and approximately one-half mile downstream and on Dyke Creek within limits of Wellsville, N. Y.

"(Signed) CORPS OF ENGINEERS."

I wish to stress that the industries in Wellsville, endangered by frequent and devastating floods, are industries engaged in national defense. This fact, it will be recalled, is mentioned in Colonel Schull's letter to me under date of January 4, 1951.

Under date of March 9, 1951, I received from Robert L. Fleisher, Esq., village attorney of Wellsville, the following letter together with a copy of an enclosure, both of which I am inserting as they bear on national defense:

MARCH 9, 1951.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: I thank you for your recent communication and telegram in connection with our flood-control program. I am enclosing, for your information, copy of letter which I am today sending to the Army engineers. Thanking you for your help in this matter and hoping you will continue actively to support our flood-control program, I am,

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) ROBERT L. FLEISHER,
Village Attorney.

MARCH 9, 1951.

C. H. CHORPENING,
Brigadier General, United States Army,
Office of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL CHORPENING: Senator Ives has forwarded to me copy of your letter to him of February 23, 1951, in connection with the proposed Wellsville flood-control project. Your office has previously been sent my memorandum of December 20, 1950, which attempted to set forth in some detail the urgent need for flood control in the light of the defense and war production of this community.

I am today in receipt of further information from the Air Preheater Corp. which is supplemental to the information contained in the memorandum referred to. This corporation is now very deep in defense program and an interruption of its production would be very serious. It has unfilled orders totaling 2 years' production. These are for Ljungstrom preheaters, of which it is the only manufacturer in the United States, and they are for installation in steam plants furnishing power for public utilities, atomic-energy projects, navy yards, ordnance plants, synthetic-rubber plants, and refineries producing high-octane gasoline.

The Power Equipment Division of the National Production Authority has assigned Defense Order No. 45 to apply to its equipment. In addition, it is continuing its research for the Navy Department with regenerators as applied to gas turbines.

In order to meet its deliveries, it is erecting additional building facilities and purchasing new equipment at a cost presently in excess of $241,000.

Will you kindly take these additional factors into consideration in connection with your efforts to speedily hasten the authorized program at Wellsville, the need for which you have indicated your recognition of.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT L. FLEISHER,
Village Attorney.

I repeat that the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for planning this flood-control project is $34,500.

I feel that inasmuch as this is an area of national defense industries it is entirely inadequate, but the planning item will initiate this flood-control project.

As I have said, the authorization is $609,000. If the threat of an all-out world war III is as serious as we are told and as vast appropriations indicate, it is of the utmost importance that we preserve our essential defense industries from flood damage as well as from enemy destruction.

When, on June 12, 1951, the House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, I offered an amendment to insert the planning item of $34,500 recommended by the budget for the Wellsville project. It was defeated, although the vote was the largest given for any item in the bill H. R. 4386.

I am inserting as a part of my presentation to this committee the remarks made by me on June 12, 1951, during the debate in the House on the Wellsville flood project, as follows:

[Speeches from the Congressional Record]

Mr. Davis of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Reed.

(Mr. Reed of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Reed of New York. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to express my very deep appreciation to the members of the Civil Functions Appropriations Committee. Aside from not granting any relief to me, they have shown me every courtesy and kindness. I ought to be grateful that they did that; but they are fine, conscientious men, and I want them to know that regardless of what they have done, or failed to do, I feel very strongly for them.

I am speaking today for the people of the village of Wellsville, of 8,000 population. It is a village of outstanding Americanism, both in its war efforts and in all of its civic activities. It is a credit to the United States. Through their fine civic spirit they have built up a splendid civic and industrial town. They have war plants there. They have been flooded year after year. The floods have been getting worse all the time, until last spring the damage, according to the district engineer, was $400,000.

I appeared before the Civil Functions Committee and received an authorization of something like $609,000 for this flood project. We worked with the Bureau of the Budget and they brought in a recommendation for $34,000 as a planning item. I thought surely that would be in this bill, but it is not.

Now, there is a town where floods come roaring down, oftentimes in the night. It is a terrible thing and an awful tragedy when you think of the lights going out in a town of that size, and a roaring stream coming down, sweeping through their houses, filling their furniture and their rugs and everything with mud, flooding the lower floor of the schoolhouse so that it is weeks before it can be dried out and used. There are cases where babies have been born in relief boats, resulting in premature births because of the fright of expectant mothers who had been taken out of their flooded homes in boats.

I have asked to extend my remarks, and I am going to extend in the Record the remarks that I made before the Civil Functions Committee. If you think I do not have a little vein of resentment in spite of what I said, I have, for this reason: I picked up the paper the other day and I saw where the administration had given $7,00,000 to Great Britain to build 50 miles of railroad in Africa. At the present time France has imposed the tariffs on goods we are sending there to help her prepare for her own defense for war. So you can go on with a thousand agencies where we have built roads and helped them with flood control and what not; yet in this bill, in attempting to cut, we are not cutting in the right place, but instead depriving loyal citizens the use of their own money to protect their homes, their lives, and their industry. So we are going to neglect these fine people whose sons have gone to Korea to win the war and let them be flooded out.

I presented it all, and what I have presented is in the report of the district engineer. I commend him for his fine investigation of the flood conditions in Wellsville, N. Y., this fine village of 8,000 people.

I have voted time and again against all of these foreign relief matters, every bit of it, billions of dollars' worth. You know where your tax bill is going. You know why you have got inflation, do you not? Are we going to keep this thing up, spending money abroad, and not take care of our own people? I do not believe the people are going to stand for it. In spite of the war, I question whether the tax bill that we have worked on since February 5 will receive the approval of this House. The citizens of this great Nation will sacrifice their money for essential expenditures of government. They are not willing, however, to sacrifice taxes for waste, extravagance, corruption, and foreign aid. The people are waking up to this fact, though, and coming out for their own country from now on, and, without any criticism of this committee, this was no time to cut out these projects which affect the very life of communities engaged in defense industry.

Mr. Chairman, you may recall that I appeared before your committee to obtain the authorization for an appropriation to eliminate the recurring floods which over a period of years have been inflicting great damage to the village of Wellsville in Allegany County, N. Y. This village has a population of over 8,000, according to the 1940 census. Aside from being an attractive residential community, it is a thriving, business and industrial village. There are many out-

standing defense industries in Wellsville, N. Y., which have been greatly damaged by floods.

Under date of December 27, 1950, I wrote to Col. H. W. Schull, Jr., district engineer, United States Engineers Office, 960 Ellicott Square Building, Buffalo, N. Y., as follows:

"MY DEAR COLONEL SCHULL: I shall appreciate it if you will furnish me with a complete report on the extent of the damage to the residential and industrial districts of Wellsville, N. Y., caused by the flood of November 25 and 26, 1950. I need this information for legislative purposes. I would also like to know to what extent this flood damaged potential war industries in said area. In addition, will you please let me know the severity and damage of this flood as compared with the floods incurred in 1942, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, and March 1950?"

Under date of January 4, 1951, Col. H. W. Schull, Jr., replied as follows to my letter of December 27, 1950:

"DEAR MR. REED: Reference is made to your letter of December 27, in which you requested a report on the flood at Wellsville in November 1950, and a comparison between that flood and previous floods. The enclosed map shows the limits of the areas flooded in Wellsville in July 1942, May 1946, and November 1950. These three floods caused more damage than any others. In 1942 damage was confined principally to the Dyke Creek area.

"Plants of Sinclair Refining Co., Air Preheater Co., and Julius Kayser Co. are in the flood area. The Bausch & Lomb plant on Pearl Street west of the Genesee River is not directly damaged by floods, but employees cannot get to work because it is surrounded by floodwaters. The municipal water and light plant is in the flood area.

"When it is forced to shut down the above industries and the Worthington Pump & Machinery Co., outside the flood area, are affected by loss of electric service. The Bausch & Lomb plant has only recently started operation, but all the others produced military supplies during World War II and all are potential suppliers.

"Flooded areas along Broad, Miller, Hanover, Rauber, Cameron, Chamberlain, Stevens, and Brooklyn Streets are residential, and there are a few commercial establishments affected on South Main Street. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad is damaged frequently. Except for Island Park and the baseball field on the opposite side of Dyke Creek, the remainder of the flood area is undeveloped.

"Flood damage begins at Wellsville when the river rises above 7.5 feet on the gage at the water and light plant. As a result of heavy rains, the river rose above this stage early in the afternoon of November 25, reached a peak about midnight, and then dropped below flood stage before noon on November 26. The peak was the highest on record.

"The water and light plant was shut down from November 25 to 29. Power service was interrupted for only 1 hour, after which it was supplied from another source. Water pumps were out of service for 24 hours. During that time, the supply in storage fell below a normal day's usage and would have been inadequate for fire fighting.

"Spot interviews were made after the flood and compared with damage at the same points in previous floods. On this basis, the damage at Wellsville from the November 1950 flood is estimated at $400,000. Damages to industries because of lost production were low since only the refinery normally operates on week ends.

"The following table lists the peak stages at the water and light plant and estimated damages in the floods listed in your letter:

Date	Peak flood stage	Estimated damages (adjusted to 1950 price levels)
	Feet	
July 1942	11.4	$210,000
May 1945	10.2	30,000
May 1946	13.4	250,000
April 1947	9.4	20,000
March 1948	9.8	50,000
March 1950	12.1	60,000
November 1950	14.3	400,000

"Local officials consider that clearing and snagging work done in Wellsville in 1950 reduced the peak stage of the November flood. They understand that the work was not of sufficient scope to eliminate damage in a major flood.

"Very truly yours,

"H. W. SCHULL, Jr.,
"*Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer.*"

The authorization for the Wellsville, N. Y., flood project did not become law in time to permit me to get the appropriation; moreover, it is seldom that an appropriation is made for an authorization the same year. To provide against damage to Wellsville from a flash or sudden flood pending a future appropriation I sent under date of January 11, 1950, the following letter to Col. E. H. Forney, district engineer at that time, Buffalo, N. Y.:

"DEAR COLONEL FORNEY: I have a flood-control project in my district, with reference to Dyke Creek at Wellsville, N. Y., which, of course, is part of Genesee River and its flood-control problem. The menace of recurring floods to the village of Wellsville is ever present and you may recall that I made application on November 3, 1948, to have Dyke Creek at Wellsville, N. Y., cleared under the authorization for emergency flood-control work.

"A request was submitted by Col. Herbert Vogel, then district engineer stationed at Buffalo, under date of November 18, 1948, for $20,000 for clearing and snagging in Dyke Creek and Genesee River, but funds appropriated for the purpose in the fiscal year 1949 had been exhausted before that time, I was so informed.

"I had an authorization for this entire project at Wellsville inserted in a bill which passed the House during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress but it did not pass the Senate. The bill is now pending in the Senate and I doubt if it will become a law in time to enable me to procure the appropriation this year to carry out this work.

"In the meantime the people as well as the residential sections and schools and public buildings are in danger of spring floods and even flash floods in the coming summer. Therefore, I feel that I will be under very severe criticism on the part of the people of that village unless some effort is made under the authorization for emergency flood-control work to relieve this village pending the time when the authorization for this project becomes law and the appropriation procured.

"I want to say here and now that I appreciate the fine cooperation I have had from the Corps of Engineers and I do not intend to ask for anything that I do not think has real merit. I believe that if there is any place where this emergency fund could be made available, at the earliest practicable moment to convince the people that the Government is going to relieve them of this frequent damage of property by floods as well as the danger to the life and health of the community, I think it is this particular community—Wellsville.

"I have a letter dated January 25, 1949, from Col. Herbert Vogel, the then district engineer at Buffalo, from which I quote:

"'After the next appropriation act has been passed, if you believe the urgency of the work is critical, this office will consider resubmission of the request.'

"I wish to state now that I firmly believe that the flood-control work to be performed as Wellsville is critical and in need of relief under the emergency act pending the time when the authorization becomes law and the appropriation has been made.

"Yours sincerely,

"DANIEL A. REED."

Without going into further detail the following telegram is sufficient to show the fine cooperation I received from the Army engineers:

"Re your telegram September 28, 1950, clearing and snagging operation on Genesee River and Dyke Creek at Wellsville, N. Y., completed on September 22, 1950, included removing snags, debris, and shoals, widening channel were required, widening at bends and clearing under all bridges on Genesee River within limits of Wellsville, N. Y., and approximately one-half mile downstream and on Dyke Creek within limits of Wellsville, N. Y.

"CORPS OF ENGINEERS."

I wish to stress that the industries in Wellsville, endangered by frequent and devastating floods, are industries engaged in national defense. This fact, it will be recalled, is mentioned in Colonel Schull's letter to me under date of January 4, 1951.

Under date of March 9, 1951, I received from Robert L. Fleisher, Esq., village attorney of Wellsville, the following letter together with a copy of an enclosure, both of which I am inserting as they bear on national defense:

MARCH 9, 1951.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: I thank you for your recent communication and telegram in connection with our flood-control program.

I am enclosing, for your information, copy of letter which I am today sending to the Army engineers. Thanking you for your help in this matter and hoping you will continue actively to support our flood-control program, I am

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT L. FLEISHER, *Village Attorney.*

MARCH 9, 1951.

C. H. CHORPENING,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL CHORPENING: Senator Ives has forwarded to me copy of your letter to him of February 23, 1951, in connection with the proposed Wellsville flood-control project. Your office has previously been sent my memorandum of December 20, 1950, which attempted to set forth in some detail the urgent need for flood control in the light of the defense and war production of this community.

I am today in receipt of further information from the Air Preheater Corp. which is supplemental to the information contained in the memorandum referred to. This corporation is now very deep in the defense program and an interruption of its production would be very serious. It has unfilled orders totaling 2 years' production. These are for Ljungstrom preheaters, of which it is the only manufacturer in the United States, and they are for installation in steam plants furnishing power for public utilities atomic energy projects, navy yards, ordnance plants, synthetic rubber plants, and refineries producing high-octane gasoline.

The Power Equipment Division of the National Production Authority has assigned Defense Order No. 45 to apply to its equipment. In addition, it is continuing its research for the Navy Department with regenerators as applied to gas turbines.

In order to meet its deliveries, it is erecting additional building facilities and purchasing new equipment at a cost presently in excess of $241,000.

Will you kindly take these additional factors into consideration in connection with your efforts to speedily hasten the authorized program at Wellsville, the need for which you have indicated your recognition.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT L. FLEISHER, *Village Attorney.*

Mr. Chairman, the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for planning this flood-control project is $34,500.

I feel that inasmuch as this is an area of national defense industries it is entirely inadequate.

The authorization is $609,000. If the threat of an all-out war is as serious as we are told and as vast appropriations indicate, it is of the utmost importance that we preserve our essential defense industries from flood damage as well as from enemy destruction.

WELLSVILLE FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT—SPEECH OF HON. DANIEL A. REED, OF NEW YORK, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, THURSDAY, JUNE 14, 1951

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes, if I need that much time, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the fine speeches that have been made for different flood projects set forth in the civil functions bill. I have also noted the result of the adverse votes, so it is with some temerity that I come before the House. I would not do so if I did not feel that this is a most worthy project, affecting the lives and property of the people in a village of 8,000 population—Wellsville, N. Y.—where there are several very important defense plants. The village of Wellsville, N. Y., is frequently subjected to disastrous floods.

Sometimes the question is asked why is it that people do not move out of flood areas; why do they stay in a place that is flooded year after year?

Some years ago I stood on the hills looking down upon the beautiful city of Johnstown, Pa. I was with one of the distinguished citizens of that town. As we stood there he described in vivid language the Johnstown flood that stirred the emotions not only of the people of this Nation but of the entire world. When the flood came down through that city it was a major tragedy. My friend said, "I am the only surviving member of a large family." Then pointing to a distant cemetery, "You see those little monuments over there glistening in the sun?" I said, "Yes." He remarked, "I often wonder if my brothers and sisters and father and mother are buried there. I saved myself," he said, "by hanging onto a piece of timber, and when the flood receded a little group of us orphans sat down. We were hungry and wet. We debated whether we should leave this place where we had grown up and played together or go down to Pittsburgh and be bootblacks or sell newspapers." He said, "We all cried out, 'Let us stay here. This is home'."

Then my friend explained that "from that day on"—and he was then 60 years old or more—"I have never failed to make some contribution to the civic weal of my home town."

That is one reason why people stay in a flood area. Then he pointed out the beautiful buildings, playgrounds, and parks that had been established in this once-flooded district of his home city.

There is another illustration of why people refuse to desert their home town in its hour of flood disaster. The men who follow the lines of battle to bury our dead soldiers tell us that invariably the dying man reaches for the inner pocket for some little keepsake of his mother, wife, or loved one back home—all of which teaches us that our boys are not fighting because of abstract rights and responsibilities of international relations; they are fighting because of love of God and home and native land. Yes; it is love of God and home and native land that enters into the souls of our soldiers and makes their arms invincible. The stability of this Nation is in the homes in our villages and cities.

Why should this village of Wellsville, N. Y., a Christian community, whose sons are fighting for this country, whose sons are being killed and wounded, be denied this item of $34,500 by this administration—and this item is all I am asking for—to carry on the preliminary work looking to the eventual relief of these people? Floods are costing them $400,000 a year. Somebody here said that taxes are increasing. Yes; they are increasing in this community to the extent of $400,000 in flood damages that this Government can save, if it will, and having once saved this amount of damages, the people can pay taxes with less sacrifice.

I am interested in comparable flood projects, but I say—and I am not going into what I said yesterday with reference to Wellsville, N. Y., project—but I do say that failure to furnish flood relief for this village is a reminder that "where there is no vision the people perish." People are perishing in our home communities from floods while the boys are fighting in Korea, and they are fighting not because of international problems; they are fighting, as I have said, for love of God and home and native land. That is why the boys are fighting and they do not want to come back to their flooded homes because of the indifference and neglect of their own Government. They do not want to return from Korea to find their loved ones flooded out because the Government for which they have been fighting refused to go anything to save their homes.

I cannot see why we should not put this item in the bill, in spite of the action that has been taken; it is justified in every sense of the word.

Yesterday I put in the recommendation of the engineers all the facts pertaining to this flood project, and I felt there was hope for favorable action on this amendment I have offered today. I have the utmost respect and affection for the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Rabaut; he is an able man, and I know he

is a man of integrity and a man who will not, I feel sure, go back on his word. When testimony was taken before this committee asking for this relief, this colloquy took place, as appears on page 4 of the hearings:

"Mr. RABAUT. This project has a budget estimate?

"Mr. REED. Yes; $34,000."

Then the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Rabaut said:

"I think they have made a good justification of it."

When he said that, I sent word out to the district that a distinguished member of this committee on the majority side had said that he agreed that it was a sound project; the people of Wellsville, N. Y., had reason to expect favorable action on their flood project.

As I say, I know that Representative Rabaut is a man integrity, who will not go back on his word, and I now look to him to support me in getting relief in this matter of flood control.

Representative REED. The mayor of Wellsville is here, Mr. Martin, and also the village attorney, Mr. Robert L. Fleisher. They can go into specific details.

Chairman MCKELLAR. After we hear from the other Congressmen we shall be glad to do that.

I want to make a suggestion to you, if you do not mind.

Representative REED. Yes, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Have you talked to Mr. Cannon?

Representative REED. I took this up with Mr. Cannon.

Chairman MCKELLAR. You had better take it up with him again.

Representative REED. Yes, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. We are very much obliged to you.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN C. BUTLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

BUFFALO HARBOR PROJECT, BUFFALO, N. Y.

Senator IVES. The next witness is Congressman John C. Butler on the Buffalo Harbor project.

Representative BUTLER. Buffalo Harbor is not a new project; it is an old project. It is the Buffalo Harbor River and Ship Canal. It was authorized in March 1945, I believe.

Chairman MCKELLAR. What is it you want done?

RESTORATION REQUESTED

Representative BUTLER. I want to restore the $305,000 that the Army engineers requested.

Chairman MCKELLAR. What did the budget do?

Representative BUTLER. The budget approved it and the Appropriation Committee eliminated it.

Chairman MCKELLAR. The budget approved it and the House eliminated it?

Representative BUTLER. That is right. All we are asking for is the $305,000.

Chairman MCKELLAR. What are the particular reasons why it is necessary?

Representative BUTLER. Well, they are deepening channels in the Buffalo River there and there is a lot of stone and rock that they are blasting and getting out, so that larger ships can draw full draft going up to the steel plants. We feel it is quite important to the war

effort because when they go up to the Republic Steel plant they have to carry a lighter load.

DEPTH OF HARBOR

Senator KNOWLAND. What is the depth now, Congressman?

Representative BUTLER. Around 19 feet 6 inches, and it is supposed to be 22 feet in the ground and 25 feet in the rock.

The blasting up there early this spring disturbed the foundation of one of our lift bridges and the abutment is leaning out in the river now. We feel as though we do not want to go ahead and put in a new abutment there and then go ahead and blast and have the same thing happen. We would like to get that work done so they can go up past the bridge, and then we can do the work and do a permanent job of it. The truck traffic is very heavy on streets near this bridge. The trucks used to go that way. Now they have to divert them. It is a couple of miles longer and piles the traffic on the Fuhrmann Boulevard.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Of course, steel is very heavy. What is the difference between the load that a tow can carry to this harbor as it is now and what they can carry if you dredge it to 22 feet? Do you have figures on that?

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST AND EXPENDITURES TO DATE

Representative BUTLER. The original project was estimated to cost $16,146,000 in 1945. We are now in 1951, and we have spent only $4,623,000. Last year they appropriated $900,000 for it. This year it was supposed to be $305,000, but they have taken that away from us. We feel as though we have been more or less penalized for something that we do not understand.

I have a statement here.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I do not think this committee wants to penalize anybody.

Representative BUTLER. I know the committee does not, but we feel as though we have been penalized for something, taking $305,000 away from us.

Senator KNOWLAND. Might I ask the engineers a question at this point?

Chairman MCKELLAR. Yes, indeed.

Senator KNOWLAND. Do I understand, Colonel, that there is a budget estimate for this item?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

DREDGING OF HARBOR PLANNED

Senator KNOWLAND. Now what precisely will the engineers do with this $305,000? Will that all be dredging?

Colonel POTTER. It will be dredging in the outer harbor, sir. There are two main entrances to Buffalo Harbor, the north and south. In stormy weather the north entrance, which contains more rock, is not particularly liked by the shippers. They want to come in the southern entrance, which is in mud and soft bottom, so that in case of a high wave, and they do bounce a little on the bottom, it will not cause so much trouble. This money would be used to take out shoals in the

southern entrance of the outer harbor. The work that the Congressman mentioned in the river is a very important part of the work, and that part which is estimated to cost in the neighborhood of $10,000,000 or $11,000,000 will come along as we get the money.

Chairman McKellar. All right, Congressman, go ahead. Do you have something you wish to put in the record?

Representative Butler. I should like to leave this statement with you so that you can refer to it.

Chairman McKellar. Without objection, that will be placed in the record.

Representative Butler. Anything that you gentlemen can do to restore this $305,000 will be appreciated by the people up home.

Chairman McKellar. We are very much obliged to you.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

In view of the importance of Buffalo Harbor I am requesting that the $305,000 recommended by the United States engineers for that harbor, and which was approved by the Bureau of the Budget but deleted by the House Committee on Appropriations, be restored by your committee in order that work may be continued on the deepening of the Buffalo River inner channel.

Buffalo is one of the larger ports on the Great Lakes and deepening to project depths is required to accommodate the deeper draft lake vessels now in use and to merit them to load to their full economical draft.

The commerce at Buffalo during the calendar year 1949 amounted to 19,800,000 tons of receipts and shipments. In addition, cargoes in transit amounted to more than 3,000,000 tons. The commerce consists principally of grain, iron ore, coal, limestone, and petroleum.

The total estimated cost is $16,146,000 of which $4,623,000 has been provided to date. Funds in the amount of $900,000 were provided in the 1951 appropriation and are being applied to deepening a section of the north entrance to the harbor and a section of the inner channel in Buffalo River.

The Buffalo Harbor project was adopted at an estimated cost (by United States engineers) of $16,146,000 in accordance with House Document 352, Seventy-eighth Congress—the River and Harbor Act of 1945, adopted March 2, 1945. (This was in the then Rivers and Harbors Committee, now Public Works.)

The $16,146,000 was the estimated cost for construction of complete project—the United States engineers furnished the estimated figures. The amount was in no way legally appropriated. Each year's appropriations must be made for the project.

STATEMENT OF HON. ERNEST GREENWOOD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

FIRE ISLAND INLET, SUFFOLK COUNTY, N. Y.

Senator Ives. The next and last Congressman is Ernest Greenwood on the Fire Island project.

Representative Greenwood. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this is the Fire Island Inlet project. It is not a new project. Some work has been done.

Chairman McKellar. Just where is it?

Representative Greenwood. In the entrance to the Great South Bay from the Atlantic Ocean off Long Island, the south side of Long Island. I think I can better read a statement which can give you a better picture of the conditions we want to remedy rather than to try to explain it.

Chairman McKellar. Go right ahead.

GROWTH OF POPULATION AND INDUSTRY

Representative GREENWOOD. I would like to submit a small map showing the location of the Fire Island Inlet. Fire Island Inlet is the only navigable inlet from the Atlantic Ocean into Great South Bay which lies in the south side of the Long Island region of Nassau and Suffolk Counties. These are the fastest growing counties in the United States. The population of my congressional district—the First Congressional District of New York—has increased 63 percent in the last 10 years. The population in 1940 was 270,000 people. Now it is 440,000, according to the 1950 census figures. Multiple housing, streamlined factories, and modern shopping centers have grown where only recently potatoes were planted.

Chairman MCKELLAR. What are your principal factories there?

Representative GREENWOOD. The Grumman plant and Republic plant, the Sperry Gyroscope plant, the Brookhaven laboratory built by the Government at a cost of approximately $150,000,000, and others. There were 70,000 houses started last year on Long Island.

INLET IMPORTANT NAVIGATION CHANNEL

This inlet is of prime importance to the people of Long Island which has the only coast line in the State of New York.

The inlet is very important as an artery of commerce in normal times. Sand, stone, brick, lumber, cement, duck and poultry food, coal and oil are transported by water. A large fleet of commercial fishermen provide food for the New York City markets, and more than 500 independent fishermen depend entirely upon these waters for their living.

Ninety percent of the fuel oil required on the southeastern shore of Long Island can be supplied by boat but the tankers have lost 50 percent of loading capacity because of the shoaling of the inlet. Where a tanker could previously load 4,500 barrels of fuel oil or gasoline, this has been reduced to 2,300, and this load is gradually decreasing.

CHANNEL NAVIGATION HAZARDOUS

At present there is a narrow channel where boats of 7 feet draft can navigate. The hurricane of 1950 further dislocated this channel, shoaling it badly. The tankers have a great deal of difficulty in making the entrance to Fire Island Inlet under the most favorable circumstances of weather, wind, and tide. Navigation is hazardous and serious groundings, accidents, and collisions have occurred. In 1948, according to Coast Guard reports, there were five vessels aground and one collision. In 1940 there were 19 aground. In 1950 there were 21 aground, 2 swamped.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I have the map before me. Did that occur between Fire Island and the south shore of Long Island?

Representative GREENWOOD. That is right.

Chairman MCKELLAR. You have to turn to a very extreme left?

Representative GREENWOOD. That is right.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Is it a rocky formation?

Representative GREENWOOD. It is a sandy shore.

SHOALING OF INLET AFFECTS FISHING INDUSTRY

The gradual shoaling of the inlet has had a further and directly detrimental effect on another important industry, that of the oyster fishermen and packers. As the inlet closed, the ebb and flow of the tide throughout the bay has decreased. This has caused a fouling of the water and bottom to an extent that the native oysters are no longer to be found in the same quantities nor of the same quality as in previous years. Our clam industry is in danger and this is extensive.

IMPORTANCE OF INLET TO COAST GUARD OPERATIONS

During World War II an important fleet of air-sea rescue vessels were based and maintained in Great South Bay. In cooperation with the work that our Army fleet performed, the Fire Island Coast Guard station maintained a valuable life-saving rescue and patrol force whose only access to the sea was through Fire Island inlet. We have the most modern equipped, fully manned Coast Guard station. In case of difficulty out at sea, in the Atlantic, the chance of lifesaving value in the present state of the inlet is almost negligible.

As a matter of defense the opening of this inlet is vitally important. Professional fishermen using the inlet in its present condition do so at risk of life and vessel. Located on Great South Bay are a large number of marine boat building and repair yards. During World War II, vessels were built for the inland lakes, Mississippi and Ohio Valleys.

Chairman McKellar. Are those repair yards used for defense purposes?

Representative Greenwood. Some of them are defense repair yards.

As I said, during World War II vessels were built for the inland lakes, Mississippi and Ohio Valleys. These were floated as far as 1,300 miles. Today these yards are ready and able to take on defense jobs and now are ready and bidding on vessels in the present defense plans but they are contingent upon the inlet being dredged.

PRESENT CHANNEL DEPTH

Chairman McKellar. What depth channel do you have now?

Representative Greenwood. We have 7 feet with a very narrow channel at the present time.

PROJECT IMPORTANCE TO DEFENSE PROGRAM

Every ton of materials and food transported by water, besides being cheaper, releases just so much rail and truck equipment. I need not remind the gentlemen that in the release of the Defense Administration of May 29 the following appeal is being made. Defense plants are already stepping up production and their requirements for coal and other fuels will grow steadily greater. Transportation must be provided for 10 percent more coal than was produced in 1950, and freight cars are in short supply and will become more so. The situation is, if anything, more acute with respect to tank cars suited to the transportation of fuel oil, and so forth. Cars of this type are

experiencing an increasingly heavy demand in high priority defense activities.

I need not mention to you our difficulties on the "bottlenecks" of the Long Island Railroad. Those difficulties are tragically well known. We have had very serious wrecks with great loss of life.

The only outlet for the 4 millions of people in Brooklyn and Queens in case of bombing would be toward the open spaces of Long Island. Roads and rails are congested now and, in case of emergency, the only avenue for securing food and other material would be via water transportation.

It is possible that our large plane factories, Grumman, Republic, Sperry Gyroscope, and other defense plants, will be depending on water transportation to bring in supplies. Republic has $500,000,000 of backlog at the present time. The Republic plant builds the F–84 Thunderjets. The enemy will wage sea warfare with modern submarines and likely these will operate where sea traffic is heaviest near the port of New York. The south shore of Long Island will be our mainstay for spotting and intercepting by fast surface patrol boats.

This week end I have been working on a project for the docking of Army crash boats already assigned to Long Island. During World War II they were stationed at Bay Shore, which is in Great South Bay, but because of the very shallow waters of the inlet, especially at low tide, there is a question as to where these boats can be docked. At that time these crash boats saved the lives of many people, including fliers testing out the new constructed planes built by the adjoining plane factories. Great South Bay has and can again provide a safe harbor as well as a shelter if the inlet project were completed.

ESTIMATED COST OF CHANNEL DREDGING

On May 17, 1950, the Corps of Engineers approved a project of dredging at the Fire Island entrance and provides for improvement of a channel 10 feet deep and 250 feet wide from deep water in the ocean to deep water in the inlet.

Chairman McKellar. What is the date of that approval?

Representative Greenwood. That was May 17, 1950.

Chairman McKellar. Did you get an appropriation for it?

Representative Greenwood. Nothing in the budget. The estimated cost is $228,000.

Business organizations, chambers of commerce, commercial fishermen's associations, service clubs, Rotary, Lions, and Kiwanis Clubs, town boards on the south side of Long Island are very strongly supporting the demand for this improvement, and we shall be grateful if the appropriation can be placed in the budget and the work accomplished at the earliest possible period.

There are here other gentlemen from Long Island, Mr. Leslie Weiss, chairman of the Fire Island Inlet Committee; Mr. Harry T. Weeks, secretary-treasurer of the Fire Island Inlet Committee; Mr. Peter Snyder, president of Patchogue Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Philip Hattemer, supervisor of the town of Brookhaven; and Mr. Joseph Kelly, supervisor of the town of Riverhead.

I thank you for your time in listening to this. I hope something can be done because it is a very serious project. I think it is a very

worthy thing to put into the budget. We need it very badly on Long Island.

Thank you very much.

Chairman McKellar. Thank you, Congressman Greenwood.

May I ask Colonel Potter how far this has gone? What have you done there?

EXPENDITURES UNDER OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Colonel Potter. With respect to the Fire Island Inlet, under other authorizations we have built 5,000 feet of jetty and have spent $594,000 up to 1947. This channel which was authorized in the last omnibus bill is a necessary adjunct to that jetty in order to maintain a 14-foot channel into the harbor.

Chairman McKellar. You mean the bill that we passed this last June?

BUDGET ESTIMATE NOT REQUESTED BY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Colonel Potter. Last May, sir, the authorization act.

Chairman McKellar. It has been authorized and approved by you but not approved by the Budget?

Colonel Potter. We did not ask for a budget estimate for this project this year.

Chairman McKellar. Why was that?

Colonel Potter. Like so many other worthy projects, there just was no room within the amount we could budget to include it.

Senator Knowland. This could not be considered a new start in the sense of the word that no work has been done?

Colonel Potter. It is a new start only in that it is work under a separate authorization, sir. It is a necessary part of the jetty project which was finished some years ago.

Chairman McKellar. But it has been authorized since 1946?

Colonel Potter. The work under discussion was authorized in 1950, sir.

STATEMENT OF HENRY VALENTE, ATTORNEY, VILLAGE OF WATKINS GLEN, N. Y.

WATKINS GLEN CREEK, SCHUYLER COUNTY, N. Y.

Senator Ives. Mr. Chairman, there are no more Congressmen, so would it be proper now to return to Monkey Run Creek and Watkins Glen Creek projects which have received the least time and consideration that has been given thus far? I ask that Congressman Cole take charge of those who want to be heard.

Representative Cole. I think perhaps Watkins Glen Creek should be the first one. Mr. Henry Valente, the attorney for the village of Watkins Glen, will discuss that.

Mr. Valente. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have with me here a report of the flood damages to Watkins Glen.

Chairman McKellar. Will you tell us who you are?

Mr. Valente. I am an attorney, Henry Valente, from Watkins Glen. I am attorney for the village of Watkins Glen.

Sixteen years ago Watkins Glen was in the same position as Kansas City is today.

Chairman McKELLAR. You are in pretty bad shape from what the papers say about it.

FLOODS IN PRIOR YEARS

Mr. VALENTE. We were in terrible shape at that time. We were practically washed out. That was in July 1935. At that time there was approximately $700,000 damage to that small community. In 1937 we were hit again to the tune of $350,000 damage.

No accurate record was kept from 1937 to 1945, but it is reasonably fair to estimate that we had a flood every other year during that time. In 1945 we had a serious flood and in 1946, and we had two floods in 1947; 1948 was a drought year. In 1949 and in 1950 we had two floods each year. This year on March 30 we had a serious flood. So floods have been very recurring.

BACKFLOW CAUSED BY GLEN CREEK GORGE

Now the cause of these floods as we see it is the overflow of Glen Creek which is a creek which passes through the village of Watkins Glen. This creek is a tributary and it passes from the gorge which is in the Watkins Glen State Park to a branch of the barge canal and then flows from the barge canal into Seneca Lake. The fall of this Glen Creek is probably around 20 feet for a distance of a mile. As the water comes out of this gorge, which has a fall of 800 feet, they slow up and when they get to the barge canal they slow up still further. When the waters are heavy the creek fills and it slows up at the lower end toward the barge canal and because of that slowing and because of the high current as it comes out of the gorge, there is a backflow. That causes the overflow of the Glen Creek banks and it flows throughout the village of Watkins Glen causing considerable damage. All we need now is a heavy rainfall and this creek overflows.

It is true that we do not have any defense plants in the village of Watkins Glen. We do have two salt companies which indirectly furnish materials for defense work. Watkins Glen is a farming community. We have two dairy plants. It is the center of a dairy industry.

Watkins Glen's assessment is only $4,500,000. We have 3,000 population. We have averaged spending at least $10,000 a year from our own funds to clean up the debris after floods. This year we have endeavored to clear out the creek but after every heavy rain the creek fills up again.

LOCAL-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

What we need is outside assistance. The State flood control commission has made a thorough study of this project. The project has been authorized, as the Congressman stated, in 1941. The United States engineers have made a study of the problem. As it stands now, the project cost to the Federal Government will be a little over $1,000,000, and the State's share will be a little over $80,000.

NO BUDGET ESTIMATE REQUESTED BY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Chairman McKellar. Colonel Potter, is there a budget estimate?

Colonel Potter. No, sir; there was not a budget estimate.

Chairman McKellar. The engineers recommended it but there was not a Budget estimate?

Colonel Potter. We have in past years, Senator, asked for appropriations on this project, but we have never received any. We did not ask for it this year in view of the rather restricted budget that we are operating under.

Chairman McKellar. Go ahead, Mr. Valente.

Mr. Valente. I should like to conclude by saying that we do need outside assistance. Watkins Glen itself cannot possibly solve the problem confronting them. We do not have the funds. That creek needs straightening and clearing up. We hope that this time you will give it serious consideration.

Chairman McKellar. Do you have a flood every year?

Mr. Valente. Twice a year for the last 2 years; in 1949 and 1950 we were hit twice each year. This year we have been hit once, March 30.

Chairman McKellar. All right, sir.

Representative Cole. Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize again what I said earlier. The justification of this project in my mind is that these people in this community have been waiting for 15 years for some relief. During World War II they hat by and made no protest against the failure to get relief. While there are no defense industries involved in it, I do feel that the community has suffered sufficiently long so that it is entitled to the sympathetic attitude of the Congress.

Chairman McKellar. At this point I think it would be wise to put the current estimates for this project in the record. I have them here and I will pass them over to the clerk.

(The information referred to is as follows:)

FLOOD DAMAGES TO WATKINS GLEN

WHAT AND WHERE IS WATKINS GLEN

Watkins Glen, a village of approximately 3,000 people, and situated at the south end of Seneca Lake, is the county seat of Schuyler County, N. Y. Noted for its Watkins Glen State Park, it is a summer-resort town. Its principal industries are two salt companies, Watkins Salt Co. and International Salt Co. Other industries are the Co-operative Grape Juice Plant, Pollio Dairy Products Corp., and the Fiorlat Dairy Products Corp. The assessed valuation of the village of Watkins Glen is 4¼ million dollars.

HISTORY OF RECENT FLOODS AT WATKINS GLEN

Attached hereto and made a part hereof is exhibit A which contains a breakdown of the flood estimates to the village of Watkins Glen, showing the estimated damages and the estimated moneys expended for the floods of 1935 and 1937, and then from 1945 to the present. From the years 1937 to 1945, records are not sufficiently clear to give a breakdown or reasonable estimate of the damages occurring and of moneys expended for the intermittent floods during that interval. It is correct, however, to say that at least once every 2 years during that intermittent period there was serious flood damage.

From said exhibit A it will be noted that the total flood damage to the village of Watkins Glen since July 1935, was at least $1,579,150, of which $337,100 was damage to municipal owned property, $127,050 damages to real estate washed away, and $1,115,000 estimated damage to privately owned property.

PROBABLE CAUSE OF THE FLOODS

The village of Watkins Glen is situated in a valley which drains into Seneca Lake. Glen Creek is a tributary which flows through Watkins Glen to a branch of the barge canal and then into Seneca Lake. As Glen Creek flows through Watkins Glen, there is very little fall, perhaps not more than 20 feet over a mile distance, and most of that 20 feet being in the first quarter mile. Just at the head of Glen Creek is the glen gorge which passes through Watkins Glen State Park. There are many water falls in that gorge and the total distance of the water falls approximates 800 feet. The watershed of Glen Creek approximates 25 square miles. During any unusually heavy rains, the surface waters all gather into this gorge and pass through Glen Creek, through the branch of the barge canal and then into Seneca Lake. As this big volume of water comes down the gorge and into Glen Creek, it swells the creek; and as the creek drains into the canal, the movement of the water has so slowed that the water backs up and further swells in Glen Creek and soon runs over the banks and through the village of Watkins Glen.

AFFECT OF FLOODS ON THE VILLAGE

Each time the banks of Glen Creek overrun not only are many privately owned homes inundated but streets are washed and cut and utilities are damaged; and after each of these floods there are months of cleaning up and fixing up and one job is hardly complete before the same thing recurs. Reference is made to exhibit A attached hereto showing the extent of damages caused by recent floods.

THE NEED FOR ASSISTANCE

The village of Watkins Glen cannot continue indefinitely under the present circumstances. The moneys expended are merely to clean up debris and repair the worst damages. The solution is to get at the cause of these floods. This has been all worked out by Government engineers and surveyors and has been incorporated in what is known as the Watkins Glen Creek flood control project. All that is lacking is the appropriation for this project. It is urgently requested that serious consideration be given to the need of Watkins Glen for flood-control assistance with the view of authorizing the necessary appropriation for the accomplishment of the Watkins Glen Glen Creek flood control project.

Flood estimates to the village of Watkins Glen, N. Y.

	Damages				Moneys expended	
	Total	Municipally owned property	Value of real estate washed away and destroyed	Estimated damages to privately owned property	By village	Other sources
July 1935	$699,150	$122,100	$77,050	$500,000	$55,000	$175,000
August 1937	350,000	75,000	25,000	250,000	15,000	25,000
April 1945	50,000	10,000		40,000	3,000	
August 1946	70,000	15,000	5,000	50,000	4,000	
June 3, 1947 / July 2, 1947	80,000	20,000	10,000	50,000	10,000	
April 1949	45,000	15,000		30,000	1,500	
October 1949	50,000	10,000		40,000	1,500	
July 15, 1950	125,000	35,000	10,000	80,000	5,000	
Nov. 25, 1950	50,000	15,000		35,000	3,000	
Mar. 30, 1951	60,000	20,000		40,000	10,000	
Total	1,579,150	337,100	127,050	1,115,000	108,000	200,000

WITNESS PROCEDURE BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE

Senator CAIN. Mr. Cole, what consideration, may I ask, was given to this particular project in the House?

Representative COLE. So far as I know, I appeared and there were no other appearances. The practice over there is quite different from

your practice here. The subcommittee in the House does not allow quite the latitude of testimony that your committee does.

Senator CAIN. It is for that reason that you bring your case here?

Representative COLE. That is right.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Are there any other witnesses?

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM C. DECKER, PRESIDENT, CORNING GLASS WORKS, CORNING, N. Y.

MONKEY RUN CREEK PROJECT, CORNING, N. Y.

Representative COLE. The next one is Monkey Run, and Mr. William C. Decker, president of Corning Glass Works, will discuss this project.

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am William C. Decker, president of Corning Glass Works.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS OF CORNING GLASS MANUFACTURING CO.

Corning Glass is the largest manufacturer of technical glassware in the world. By technical glassware I mean all types of glass except bottles and window glass and plate glass. Our main plant is located in Corning, N. Y., where Monkey Run Creek flows into the Chemung River. Our research laboratories are also located on that particular plot of ground.

A flood-control project has been started there which has taken away the hazard of floods from the Chemung River, but we still have the hazard from floods in Monkey Run. The Monkey Run floods have caused us to shut down several times since 1936, the last time being in 1946 when we shut down for approximately 6 weeks in the principal part of the main plant.

At this main plant we employ approximately 3,700 people. As I mentioned, our research laboratories are also located there and we have 220 scientists in these research laboratories. We are strictly a defense plant. Our type of glassware is used in all types of military equipment. We are the principal manufacturer of glassware for use in radar and other electronic devices. We are the principal manufacturer of optical glass used in fire-control instruments. We make all types of laboratory glassware which is used by the Atomic Energy Commission in the research laboratories of the military establishments. I could go on and list many other products that are used by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, but I will summarize that by saying that in World War II over 90 percent of the output of our main plant was priority rated materials for war and essential civilian purposes.

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST AND LOCAL-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

Now the Munitions Board and the National Production Authority have recognized that we are a critical defense plant and have so stated in letters to the Army engineers in support of this project. The total cost of the project is around $2,900,000, of which the amount to be contributed by the Federal Government is $2,370,000 and local interests will pay the balance of $610,000.

I would not be here today requesting this appropriation except for the fact that we do supply and are supplying today many items that are absolutely essential and cannot be obtained elsewhere in this coun-

try for the Military Establishment. In the last war we conducted almost 200 research projects for military forces. At the present time, today, 27 of them are under way. So both from the viewpoint of the glassware going to the Armed Forces and the research work we are doing, this is a vital defense project.

FLOOD CAUSES CLOSE DOWN OF PRODUCTION

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Decker, if you were forced to close down again, as you indicated you had once before, that would put quite a substantial dent in your productive ability?

Mr. DECKER. Yes, it would. You must understand that the melting of glass is a continuous process just like the melting of steel is, so that when a furnace goes cold it takes an awful long time to rebuild that furnace and bring it back to heat again.

Senator STENNIS. How long does it take?

Mr. DECKER. Ordinarily a month provided no extensive rebuilding is necessary. A big rebuilding job would take more than a month. But a major flood there would be likely to shut us down as long as 3 months.

Senator CAIN. If you were flooded out, would it not automatically result in a major rebuilding job? Would not the water practically destroy the units then in operation?

Mr. DECKER. That is right. As I say, a really serious flood would shut us down for at least 3 months. The lesser one in 1946 shut us down for 6 weeks.

In addition to defense considerations there are also nondefense considerations. The Army engineers have shown economic justification for the project, but today I think it is important to recognize that we are a vital military establishment and I hope that we can get this thing licked by next spring when there is going to be another danger of flood on Monkey Run Creek. I ask your respectful consideration of this project.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Thank you very much.

ORIGINAL BUDGET REQUEST

I think, Colonel Potter, you explained this a while ago, but what is the condition? Did you make a recommendation to the budget and the budget left it out?

Colonel POTTER. We made a recommendation to the budget for $925,000.

Chairman MCKELLAR. And the budget recommended a smaller amount?

BUDGET BUREAU APPROVAL OF PLANNING FUNDS

Colonel POTTER. The budget approved $25,000 for planning, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. The House cut it out?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Senator CAIN. Mr. Decker, what are the assets of Corning which overcome its liabilities, meaning that when your fine industry was first established there you must have been aware of the possibility of the recurring floods?

Mr. DECKER. Our plant was established there in 1868. It has grown like Topsy ever since. Now we have decentralized our operation by building plants in many, many States throughout the Nation. However, because of the tremendous amount of skill which has built up over these years in Corning, our high-grade glassware of the real technical types is still made in Corning. That explains why big industry is located in a very bad flood situation.

Senator CAIN. Have floods been more numerous in the last decade than in the last 30 or 40 years?

Mr. DECKER. By chance they have been. The engineers have frequency reports of floods up there, but from 1934 on they have been more serious than they have been, let us say, between the year 1900 and the year 1934. We had very bad floods in the latter part of the nineteenth century. In 1888 there was a very bad flood.

CONSTRUCTION PLANS UNDER AMOUNT REQUESTED

Senator KNOWLAND. Colonel Potter, if the amount went in that the Army engineers had recommended, $925,000, what would you be able to do with that, or a substantial part of that this first year?

Colonel POTTER. We would get started on the work. There would be $1,655,000 still to go, sir, after the $925,000, but largely we would spend that money on the conduit which would carry Monkey Run down into the Chemung River.

Senator KNOWLAND. What is your situation insofar as planning is concerned? Are you prepared if the Congress made an appropriation to move ahead, or would there be any great delay in making plans after the appropriation was granted?

Colonel POTTER. No, sir; we would be able to move right into the job. I think in view of the importance of the plant to the defense we would expedite the construction.

Senator KNOWLAND. I am frankly a little surprised on the basis of this showing in the testimony here today that the defense people working with the budget have not had a budget estimate up on this item.

Colonel POTTER. We did recommend a budget estimate on this item.

COMMUNICATIONS TO BUDGET BUREAU ON DEFENSE NEEDS FOR PROJECT

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes; but my point is that I am surprised that the budget did not send a budget estimate here to the Congress on the basis of the testimony.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Is the budget officer here? Yes; I see him now. Will you look into that and find out what that situation is?

Mr. MACPHAIL. Yes; I will, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. I would like to know whether the National Production Authority or the Defense Establishment, or whoever is normally interested in this defense production of ours, have communicated with the Budget Bureau.

Mr. DECKER. May I say that Manly Fleischmann, head of the National Production Authority, told me he wrote a letter stating our plant was a critical defense plant.

Senator KNOWLAND. To whom was that written?

Mr. DECKER. I think it was written to General Pick. Is that right?

Colonel POTTER. We have received letters concerning the defense importance of the project since we submitted the budget, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. Could we have copies of those letters for our records?

Colonel POTTER. We will produce one from the National Production Administration, sir. The other is classified and could be made available in executive session, after clearance by higher authority.

Senator KNOWLAND. I think on an item of this kind and where this appears to be on the basis of the testimony important to the national defense, that this committee is entitled to know just how important our defense authorities feel it is. If the Budget Bureau has been a little slow in making a decision on it, this committee may have to make a decision.

Colonel POTTER. I do not believe these letters have been made available to the Bureau of the Budget; I do not know, but I will make them available to the committee.

(The letter from the National Production Authority referred to is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
NATIONAL PRODUCTION AUTHORITY,
Washington, May 24, 1951.

Brig. Gen. C. H. CHORPENING,
Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works,
Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL CHORPENING: We appreciate your consideration of the defense effort in requesting our opinion as to the relative importance of the Corning Glass Works at Corning, N. Y., in the flood-control project on Monkey Run, as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 305, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

Based on the facts set forth in the letter from the Honorable Gordon Gray, Secretary of the Army, in Document No. 305 transmitted to the Congress with his letter of August 2, 1949, it would appear that your proposal to control the floods on Monkey Run Creek would be substantially justified by the protection thus afforded to the plants of the Corning Glass Works at Corning, N. Y., which are jeopardized by the periodical floods that develop from the waters of Monkey Run Creek.

The fact that the Corning's main plant, which is integrated with the laboratory and other installations of the Corning Glass Works at Corning, has been certified by the Munitions Board as a critical defense plant, would add emphasis to the importance of protecting that plant and its operations in the defense effort.

Again relying upon the facts set forth in the letter submitted by William C. Decker, president of Corning Glass Works, to the Army Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, the list of products outlined in that letter by Mr. Decker are certainly essential to the defense and defense-supporting programs with which this agency of the Government is vitally concerned.

Relying upon the foregoing facts, I feel that we would be warranted in responding to the invitation expressed in the last paragraph of your letter of May 10 to issue this statement to the effect that, in our considered judgment, the Corning Glass Works would constitute an important adjunct to the defense effort, and we would, therefore, be interested in having those plants protected by the Monkey Run flood-control project as proposed in the documents that accompanied your letter of the above date.

With kindest wishes, I am,
Very cordially yours,

MANLY FLEISCHMANN, *Administrator.*

Chairman MCKELLAR. I want to say to the two Senators from New York and the members of the committee that the full committee has a meeting at 11:45 this morning to consider the Kansas City situation where we have to pass a resolution. We will have to adjourn here. Now there are other witnesses who would like to be heard.

Representative COLE. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Horace S. Evans is the executive director of the New York State Flood Control Commission. Could he be allowed 1 minute?

Chairman MCKELLAR. Certainly, but we will give him more time if he would like to come back at 1 o'clock, or any of the witnesses who want to be heard.

Mr. EVANS. I would rather do it now.

Senator IVES. Mr. Chairman, before you get into this, I am curious to know if there is anybody from Wellsville who would like to be heard yet? The answer is "Yes," so in that case I think we would be better off to recess.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Suppose we recess until 2 o'clock, and we can come back here and finish up.

Senator KNOWLAND. If the witness who was about to testify has to get back to New York or something, we could put his statement in the record perhaps.

STATEMENT OF HORACE S. EVANS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NEW YORK STATE FLOOD CONTROL COMMISSION

MONKEY CREEK PROJECT, CORNING, N. Y.

Mr. EVANS. I can do the whole thing in 3 minutes and then submit my memorandum.

My name is Horace S. Evans. I am executive director of the New York State Flood Control Commission. This commission is the official agency of New York State, created in 1936 to assist in the institution of consummation of the Federal long-range program of flood control. Two of the prime movers incidentally, gentlemen, are the two Senators from New York now, another one is the majority leader of the assembly, and the other is the Governor.

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST

I am just speaking on the Corning project. It is the most important and so rated by the New York State Flood Control Commission of all the projects in New York State. The estimated cost of that is around $2,980,000. $610,000 is non-Federal cost.

My commission is prepared to recommend participation to that extent which consists of acquiring land easements, rights-of-way, and maintaining the project after completion.

I do not know whether the witnesses previously brought out the one fact that this Monkey Run Creek of Corning rises in the Peekskills west of the city and flows underneath the main plant of the Corning Glass Works and affects the research laboratories. Any flood in that stream, in that watershed, naturally slows up production there.

I might state that Monkey Run Creek has a very limited capacity at that point. The project as proposed by the Chief of Engineers, as authorized by Congress, would eliminate that condition by carrying the waters through an open flume and then through a twin-barrel conduit.

Now this is not a new project. It is a modification of an existing project. The work that has been done there has been of tremendous

value, but until this is done the jugular vein of Corning Glass Works—that thing that affects them most vitally—until that is controlled the plant is in danger.

I am advised that Mr. Fleischmann of the National Production Authority and also the Munitions Board have approved this project.

I should like to file this statement for the record, and also a statement by Senator Ives.

Chairman McKellar. Without objection that may be done.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

MEMORANDUM RE APPROPRIATION FOR MONKEY RUN CREEK FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT, CORNING, N. Y.

By: Senator Irving M. Ives.
To: United States Senate Committee on Appropriations.

This is a formal request that your distinguished committee include in the Army civil-functions appropriation bill sufficient funds for immediate undertaking of the flood-control project on Monkey Run Creek at Corning, N. Y.

This project was authorized in the 1950 Federal Flood Control Act. It is not a new project but is a modification of an existing flood-control project at Corning and is designed to provide flood control for a section of Corning which is not now projected by the existing improvement.

In that section of Corning which will be protected by the proposed improvement are located the main plant and research laboratories of the Corning Glass Works, one of the highly critical defense plants of the Nation. It has been so certified (as a critical defense plant) by the National Munitions Board and the project has approval and recommendation for construction by the National Production Authority.

Monkey Run Creek rises in the steep hills above the city of Corning, flows through the heart of the city and underneath the main plant and research laboratories of the Corning Glass Works, finally discharging into the Chemung River. During periods of heavy precipitation this creek is a mean, flashy stream and is the cause of great flood damages. The existing flood-protective works at Corning are on the Chemung River and Post and Cutler Creeks. There are no protective works on Monkey Run Creek. The subject project would provide for control of Monkey Run Creek floodwaters.

Operation of the Corning Glass Works main plant requires 3,750 employees and the research laboratory 218 employees. This plant and laboratory are of major importance in the present defense program and in the event of full mobilization would become of much greater importance. It is essential from a view point of national defense that they continue functioning without interruption. Plant shutdowns resulting from Monkey Run floods since 1935 have necessitated seven lay-offs of Corning Glass Works employees. When a major flood occurs, water reaches sufficient height in the plant to enter stack flues of the largest glass-smelting furnaces and in such cases operations throughout the entire plant, including research laboratories, are affected. It requires as long as 8 weeks to restore normal operations in the largest glass furnaces, and at such times many of the skilled and unskilled workers in the plant are permanently lost because of employment elsewhere.

This plant is the major or sole source of supply for many of the military and essential civilian products which it is engaged in manufacturing. A partial list of these products follows:

1. Bulbs, tubing and flares for use in radar, radio, and other electronic tubes.
2. Optical glass for use in bomb sights, tank periscopes, fire-control instruments, and aerial camera lenses.
3. Glass pipe for use in atomic-energy plants and in plants producing chemicals used in the manufacture of rocket fuels.
4. Glassware used in Government and industrial research laboratories.
5. Glassware used in the manufacture of pharmaceuticals, clinical and industrial thermometers, blueprint machines, beacon and airport lighting, and signaling devices for aircraft, railroads, and ships.

During World War II Corning's research laboratories worked on 174 wartime projects. Work is currently in progress on 27 such developments. For security reasons no details of these projects are given here.

Because of defense considerations, the Flood Control Commission of the State of New York rates the Monkey Run project as the most important of all authorized flood-control projects in the State.

As you are aware, one of the requisites of this project is that there be local cooperation to the extent of furnishing lands, easements, and rights of way; relocating and readjusting utilities; and maintenance of the project after completion. The flood-control law of New York State provides that the State may act as the "local interest" in flood-control projects. It permits the State to cooperate with the Federal Government in prosecution of flood-control projects through the New York State Flood Control Commission and the New York State Department of Public Works. Incidentally, I had the privilege, as majority leader of the New York State Assembly in 1936, to sponsor New York's flood-control law which is held by the Corps of Engineers to be a model for the Nation.

The State Flood Control Commission has formally approved the project both in correspondence and in personal appearances before the Army Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and the United States Senate Committee on Public Works. It is prepared and willing to sponsor execution of an agreement assuring the Corps of Engineers of State participation as required.

In conclusion, I state this project on Monkey Run Creek at Corning, N. Y., meets all criteria of the President regarding disbursement of funds for flood-control projects in that it—

(*a*) Is not a new project but is—and the congressional authorization so states—a modification of the existing project at Corning.

(*b*) It is essential, highly so, for protection of a critical national defense industry, the Corning Glass Works—so certified by the National Munitions Board and the National Production Authority.

(*c*) Non-Federal participation as required by Congress and the Department of the Army is assured.

You are respectfully urged to appropriate the funds necessary for immediate prosecution of the Monkey Run Creek flood-control project.

MEMORANDUM RE APPROPRIATION FOR MONKEY RUN CREEK FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT, CORNING, N. Y.

To: The Army Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate.

From: Horace E. Evans, executive director, New York State Flood Control Commission, Albany, N. Y.

It is a pleasure to appear before your distinguished group and present this memorandum urging appropriation of funds for prosecution of the authorized flood-control project on Monkey Run Creek, designed for protection of Corning, N. Y.

The New York State Flood Control Commission, which I represent, is the official agency of the State responsible for assisting in the institution and consummation of a Federal long-range program of flood control in all areas of New York State where hazards from floodwaters obtain. This Commission was created by chapter 16 of the Laws of 1936 and now is functioning under chapter 15 of the New York State Laws of 1951.

Congress in the 1950 Federal Flood Control Act authorized, upon recommendation of the Department of the Army, a project for improvement of Monkey Run Creek at Corning at an estimated Federal cost of $2,370,000. This is not a new project but is a modification—and the authorization so states—of an existing project on the Chemung River at Corning which was authorized in the 1936 Federal Flood Control Act.

The importance of the Monkey Run Creek flood-control project to the national defense and possible war efforts is so great that my commission is of the definite opinion that the improvement should be placed under construction and completed at the earliest possible time. A memorandum detailing national defense operations and research now in process at the Corning Glass Works will be submitted by William C. Decker, president of the Corning Glass Works.

Corning, one of the most important industrial centers in southern New York, is situated on the Chemung River, in Steuben County. This river passes through Elmira, about 17 miles downstream of Corning, and joins the Susquehanna River at Syre, Pa. Flowing through the heart of Corning and beneath the main plant of the Corning Glass Works is Monkey Run Creek, a flashy tributary stream.

The main plant of the Corning Glass Works, and also the research laboratories, are located in the flood plain of Monkey Run Creek.

The Corps of Engineers in 1942 completed a flood-control project at Corning consisting of flood walls and levees along the Chemung River and Cutler and Post Creeks, two tributaries with a conduit provided on Cutler Creek. Although this project protects Corning against flood stages approximately 6 feet higher than the greatest of record in the Chemung River and controls flood discharges of Cutler and Post Creeks, the protection necessary for this thriving municipality cannot be realized until the authorized project on Monkey Run Creek is completed.

As proposed by Army engineers and authorized by Congress, the works on Monkey Run Creek provide for an open flume and a conduit to convey the discharge through the city's business and industrial area and into the Chemung River downstream of the main plant and research laboratories of the Corning Glass Works; auxiliary works consisting of storm-sewer outlets, a pumping plant, and relocation and reconstruction of facilities of utilities. The flume section will be 1,870 feet long, and the conduit about 2,280 feet long. Capacity of the present Monkey Run Creek in the upper limits, which has been improved by the city, is 1,500 cubic feet per second, and in the lower reaches is 500 cubic feet per second. The improvement proposed begins at the lower end of the 1,500-cubic-feet-per-second channel. Design capacity of the new Monkey Run improvement will be 2,500 subic feet per second at low stage in the Chemung River, and 1,000 cubic feet per second at high stage of the river. Estimated cost of the project is $2,980,000, of which $2,370,000 is the estimated Federal share and $610,000 the non-Federal share. The ratio of benefits to cost is exceptionally favorable, being 1.83 to 1.

The Monkey Run Creek project will control waters of this tributary stream during periods of heavy precipitation. Existing control provided by the city of Corning is sufficient to take care of the stream during ordinary times. However, during periods of extremely heavy run-off these existing municipal works are insufficient to handle the discharge, and the result is that a vulnerable section of Corning is without adequate protection from floods. This is not to belittle the works already completed—those on the Chemung River, Post and Cutler Creeks. They have been of tremendous value and, I understand from the North Atlantic division engineer, United States Corps of Engineers, have virtually paid for themselves in benefits already realized.

The New York State Flood Control Commission, in cooperation with the Federal Government, has developed a flood-control program comprising 59 authorized and approved projects representing a capital investment of $134,781,000 by the Federal and State governments—this since 1936. Some of these projects have been completed, others are under construction, and some are proposed for future undertaking. This commission holds that most important of all projects at this particular time is the one on Monkey Run Creek. Under existing State law New York State acts as the non-Federal interest in cooperating with the Federal Government—financially and otherwise—in all flood-control projects. This commission is willing, anxious, and prepared to accept required State participation in the project by execution of a document assuring the Federal Government of such participation.

I have been informed that the Corning Glass Works has been certified as a critical defense plant by the National Munitions Board and that the Monkey Run Creek project has approval and recommendation for construction by the National Production Authority. This project meets all requirements of the President relative to appropriations for civil functions of the Department of the Army.

1. It is not a new project. It is a modification and continuation of an existing project.

2. It protects an area and an industry essential and vital to the national defense and potential war effort. It has been approved and recommended for construction by the National Production Authority, and the plant it protects, Corning Glass Works, has been certified as a critical defense plant by the National Munitions Board.

3. There is no question of local or non-Federal participation. That is assured.

I thank you for the privilege of appearing before you and urge again that you appropriate funds necessary for immediate construction of the Monkey Run Creek project.

Chairman McKellar. The committee will now recess until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

AFTER RECESS

Chairman McKellar. Who is your next witness?

Mr. Weeks. Mr. Chairman, I think the mayor of Wellsville is here, and wishes to talk.

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS C. MARTIN, MAYOR, WELLSVILLE, N. Y.

WELLSVILLE FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT, ALLEGANY COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. Martin. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to thank you for the privilege of being here, and I want to thank Senator Lehman and Senator Ives, and Congressman Reed for the efforts they have made in their appeal for the Wellsville flood-control project.

I am going to be very brief, because the village attorney is with me, and I am going to give up my time to him.

However, I do want to review the Wellsville project. It has been one of my hobbies since I became mayor back in 1938, because I realized the seriousness of the flood control in Wellsville, due to the fact that each succeeding year our floods were getting greater and greater.

We have today a great many industries that are on the defense program, especially the Sinclair Refining Co., which is one of the largest refining companies in the world, that is refining pure Pennsylvania oil.

We are situated on the Genesee River, at the head of the Genesee River, coming into Wellsville, which could be as serious as your Kansas flood, if they had a fire similar to theirs.

I think, myself, that this Kansas flood has more or less made us all flood conscious. I have talked with others that have been here today for the same purpose that I am, and, in talking to them, they feel the same way.

However, I am not going to go into the details, but I do know that State is ready to back us to the extent of $50,000, and we do feel that this is a project that is well worth while.

It is not a big project. It does not mean too much. I am making an appeal to you to consider the estimate of $35,000, which is the engineers' planning. If that is put back in, it will make our project safe.

I thank you.

Chairman McKellar. We were very glad to have you.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT L. FLEISCHER, VILLAGE ATTORNEY, WELLSVILLE, N. Y.

WELLSVILLE FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, NEW YORK

Chairman McKellar. You may proceed, Mr. Fleischer.

Mr. Fleischer. The people of Wellsville feel as if this is the Supreme Court. It is their last opportunity to get what we have been after for 15 years, to my knowledge.

Chairman McKellar. Let me ask a question of Colonel Potter.

Colonel Potter, I see that planning was disallowed?

Colonel Potter. Yes, sir.

Chairman McKellar. Why was that?

Colonel Potter. The House report stated that they do not believe that any planning money or survey money should be permitted this year. Hence, the House struck all planning money and all money for surveys from the bill.

1952 BUDGET ESTIMATE FOR PLANNING FUNDS

This project was included in the total amount for planning that was struck out.

Senator Ecton. Did the budget recommend this?

Colonel Potter. Yes, sir; the budget recommended $34,500 for planning on this project.

Chairman McKellar. And the engineers recommend it?

Colonel Potter. Yes, sir; we recommended it in our budget recommendations to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Fleischer. I might say, of the 34 projects which were unanimously stricken in the House, the Wellsville project received the greatest vote, according to Mr. Reed, who spoke to you earlier today.

In Wellsville, as has been intimated by Mayor Martin, we have a recurrence of floods, year after year, of the Genesee River and its tributaries. These floods come at times which are unknown.

Normally, they are floods that occur in the spring, with the melting of the snows.

But our most recent and most disastrous flood occurred in November of 1950, during which—and as a result of which—we suffered the greatest loss we had ever had previously.

FLOOD HAZARD TO DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Now, Wellsville, we feel—and I think justly so—is a typical American city. It is 8,000 or 9,000 in population. We have, as evidence of that typicalness, plants which are very intimately connected with the defense or war efforts, principally the Sinclair Refining Co., which is, as the mayor indicated, the largest producer of Pennsylvania-type lubricant in the country, and the type of lubricant that is required by the Air Forces in connection with their motor operations.

During the last war, 50 percent or more of their production was allocated completely to the war effort.

We have a grave situation there in connection with, as was explained to me by the superintendent of the Sinclair Refineries, the floodwaters causing a hazard, a fire hazard, by the floodwaters coming in contact with and causing the breakage of hot oil lines.

Now, were that to occur, our city would be totally destroyed.

We have, in addition to the Sinclair Refining Co. a branch of the Worthington Pump & Machinery Corp.

They manufacture steam turbines in Wellsville, and most of their production goes to the Navy and to the Air Force.

We have, in addition to that, the Air Pre-Heater Corp., which manufactures preheaters for war use on destroyers and battleships.

We have several smaller industries, the Bausch & Lomb Optical

Co., which, of course, is a war industry; the Kerr's Silk Mills, and one or two smaller industries.

AMOUNT OF APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION

This project was authorized in 1950 by the House and by the Senate. It occurs to me—and it might be interesting to note—that in spite of the fact that economy was one of the measures which was understood and appreciated by that legislation, that such project in the amount of $745,000 was authorized at that time.

We feel that in the light of the war production in Wellsville, the defense production in Wellsville, and the actual damage that these floods occasion, that it is not a project similar to a lot of the others, which do not directly tie up with that sort of emergency.

I think that this committee has before it—and we have appeared—Martin and I, on a number of occasions here in the last few years before various committees—all of the cumulative reports as to what we have testified to on previous occasions.

I believe that is about all I have to say at this particular time.

I would like, possibly, to have Senator Lehman say a word or two in our behalf.

Senator LEHMAN. I am submitting a memorandum for the record. I cannot speak on one project without speaking on all of them, and the time is limited. I do not want to take up the time.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Thank you, Mr. Fleischer.

Who is the next witness?

Mr. FLEISCHER. We just have the mayor and myself.

Senator LEHMAN. May I say to you, Mr. Fleischer, that I have frankly expressed myself on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere, in regard to the importance of flood control.

Chairman MCKELLAR. As noted hereon, Mr. Meade C. Dobson is to be the next witness.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Dobson is not here. Mr. Leslie Weiss is here.

STATEMENT OF LESLIE WEISS, CHAIRMAN, FIRE ISLAND INLET COMMITTEE

FIRE ISLAND INLET PROJECT, SUFFOLK COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. WEISS. My name is Leslie Weiss. I am a resident of the village of Bellport, Long Island, which is 65 miles from New York City, near Brookhaven, on the south shore of Long Island.

I am an electrical engineer. I am chairman of the Fire Island Inlet Committee, the vice president and director of the Long Island Association, the director of the Patchogue Chamber of Commerce, the trustee of the South Side Hospital.

My interest in this situation is purely civic. I have no boat or I am not operating an industry that depends upon water transportation.

Gentlemen, more than 5,000,000 Americans live on Long Island. If Long Island were a separate State, it would rank eighth in the Nation.

Several hundred thousands of people live on the isalnd, and are directly affected by Fire Island Inlet. All of them are eagerly await-

ing a favorable decision because it affects their safety, their health, their industry, their commerce, their natural resources, their economy, and their national defense.

The Fire Inlet Committee represents these people through their various organizations, such as the Long Island Association, with 1,300 members, the Long Island Fisherman's Association with 1,500 members, the combined chambers of commerce of the south shore communities, with a membership of 1,000, and also the governments of the towns and incorporated villages, who are represented on this committee.

Our committee appreciates this opportunity to appear before you for the purpose of submitting to you a few basic facts concerning Fire Island Inlet and why its navigability is of such vital importance to the people living along the south shore of Long Island.

To save you time, and bearing in mind the old adage that one picture is forth a thousand words, we are resorting to a visual presentation.

LOCATION OF INLET

Thirty-five percent of the people in New York State live on Long Island. Consequently, in one way or another, 35 percent of the people in New York State are affected by Fire Island Inlet.

Fire Island Inlet is 50 miles by water from New York City, and serves 15 major communities, stretching for 45 miles along the south shore of Long Island.

Senator ECTON. Mr. Weiss, would you point out on that map where Fire Island is located?

Mr. WEISS. This is Fire Island on the map, which is the only access from the Atlantic Ocean to the great South Bay, which practically covers the entire south shore.

Senator ECTON. That red line out in the water there, is that land?

Mr. WEISS. Yes; that is a beach, known as Fire Island.

Senator ECTON. And that long narrow stretch there, what is that?

Mr. WEISS. Yes, that is the Fire Island. This point of the map represents the inlet, and it is the only means of access to these major south shore communities on the island.

Senator ECTON. You have what—14 communities?

Mr. WEISS. Fourteen are shown there. There is one other one. There is a total of 15.

The major highways of the island flow westward toward the metropolitan area and are connected with Manhattan Island and the Bronx by means of six bridges and two tunnels. That would be here, on the map. Most of the main roads flow across the island, and this is the means of the vehicular traffic access, by means of those bridges and the tunnels.

Now, visualize an enemy attack which could destroy these bridges and tunnels. The wreckage of the bridges would block the East River, and access to and from the north shore of Long Island by means of Long Island Sound, which would be here on the map, access to that part of Long Island would be completely closed. The only means of access to Long Island would be through Fire Island Inlet.

If such bombing occurred, approximately 200,000 people who work and live in the area served by the inlet would be cut off from the mainland.

Conversely, refugees attempting to leave the metropolitan area also would be cut off from Long Island and denied its facilities.

Now, just how important is the south shore of Long Island? Nearly 60 percent of Suffolk County's people live in this area. It is the fastest growing section of the county, and one of the fastest in the State of New York.

Here, during the past 10 years, the population increased 49 percent, as compared to 38 percent for the county.

This is a tremendous increase when we compare it with the growth of the State as a whole, which increased 9.4 percent; Long Island, as a whole, 13.1 percent; Suffolk County, 38 percent; and the Fire Island Inlet area, 49 percent.

In addition to the people living in the inlet area, there are thousands that commute by car back and forth to the various industrial plants located in this area, especially to the aircraft industries and allied defense industries.

What sort of a territory is this; what are its natural resources; what does it contribute to the productivity of the Nation, its defense, and its share of Federal taxes?

Some people have had an idea that the island is a playground. To some extent that may have been true long ago, but during the past 10 years there have been tremendous strides made in the industrial expansion of the island.

The Department of Commerce statistics show that from 1939 to 1947 industrial production increased 540 percent, increasing from $7,000,000 annually in 1939 to nearly $50,000,000 in 1947.

In the first 7 months of this year, the industries in this area have obtained contracts for defense orders amounting to over $100,000,000, and Suffolk County ranks first in defense contracts on Long Island; Kings County, in which Brooklyn is located, ranks second, with only one-third of the volume of Suffolk's defense contracts; Nassau County, with a $20,000,000 volume, ranks third; Queens County is fourth, being slightly behind Nassau.

The payrolls for these industries operating in the Fire Island Inlet area are approximately $37,000,000.

Now, here are located such important manufacturers of defense and war equipment as aircraft, instruments, tools, and accessories. There are 18 plants producing aircraft parts and auxiliary equipment.

Four of these plants employ more than 24,000 people. Grumman, producer of Navy jets, employs 7,500. Republic, manufacturer of Army jets, employs 12,000. Ranger, producer of guided missiles, employs 1,200. Liberty, a maker of aircraft parts, employs 1,800. Sperry Gyroscope, manufacturer of aeronautical and marine instruments, employs 7,000.

In addition to these defense plants, there is located within a short distance of the inlet the Associated Universities, Brookhaven National Laboratory, which is one of the major atomic research centers in this country, and in which the Federal Government has, I am told, spent about $150,000,000.

The employees of all of these plants depend upon petroleum products for their transportation, and for fuel for heating their homes. Their productivity is dependent upon their ability to maintain their health, to maintain the necessary foods and essential supplies.

Speaking of foods reminds us that during the last war, Suffolk County ranked third in the Nation as a producer of foods.

To give you some idea of the type of foods produced there, I would like to list a few of them. For instance, 12,000,000 pounds of ducks are produced annually; 12,000,000 pounds of fish, 15,000,000 pounds of oysters and clams, 74,000,000 pounds of cauliflower, and 750,000,000 pounds of potatoes.

Yes, Long Island is an important producer of foods for metropolitan New York.

Transportation facilities between it and Long Island must be maintained under all conditions. Therefore, Fire Island Inlet has the only access to the south shore and must be maintained in a navigable condition.

These 15 south shore communities serve as important supply centers to the population of Long Island.

In a 10-year period, retail sales rose 94 percent, wholesale sales, 26 percent, the service trades industries, 336 percent, and farm commodities 295 percent.

Increased sales mean more taxes for the Federal Government.

These trends indicate not only the rapid growth of the territory but its substantial scope in serving the people, not only of Long Island, but the metropolitan area.

It is obvious that a drastic change in the character of the island has taken place, a transition from a playground to one of vital industry. Rapidly disappearing are the expansive estates of the wealthy, and in their stead is springing up large communities of the average American homes.

NAVIGATION FEATURES OF PROJECT

Fire Island Inlet is not a new project. For many years it served as a channel of transportation for lumber, coal, oil, gasoline, ballast, and miscellaneous supplies. Yes, it also serves the fishing and shellfishing industries and the transportation of their products and supplies to and from their plants, located on the south shore.

This is a United States Government project in which nearly $1,000,000 was expended for the erection of the jetties in 1941.

DREDGING OF CHANNEL NEEDED

The inlet now requires dredging, a maintenance job which was approved by the Board of Rivers and Harbors' engineers in 1950 and again in the 1951 rivers and harbors bill.

The Army engineers' Document No. 762, based on figures dating back to 1935, shows that dredging the inlet would result in a total annual savings to the area greater than the first cost of the entire project.

Since that time, these benefits would have increased threefold. Commercial vessels, such as oil tankers, need depths, varying from 7 to 12 feet for a safe passage through the channel. At the present time, the depth, under normal conditions, does not exceed 5 or 6 feet in the places where there should be a channel.

Finding one's way through the channel is an extremely hazardous operation, and even the most skilled navigators have a great deal of

difficulty in bringing the tankers and commercial vessels through there.

Consequently, these vessels cannot pass through the inlet carrying capacity loads. As an illustration, the oil tankers whch are capable of carrying 250,000 gallons, recently tried, under the most favorable winds and tide, to pass through the channel with loads of only 38 percent of their capacity, but have been unable to do so.

On two occasions, they have run aground, and one of these, the *Mattox*, sustained damages in the amount of $25,000.

These are the type of tankers which, during normal times, should pass through the inlet three times a week, in order to provide adequate fuel and petroleum supplies to the people in that area of Long Island.

The storage tanks will hold 4,000,000 gallons. The public demand is for 15,000,000 gallons, which goes to show that these tankers must come through regularly.

Because of the international situation, it is most important, more than ever, to make the most effective use of all transportation and storage facilities. This was emphasized recently by William B. Hayes, Assistant Director of Petroleum Administration for Defense, who said:

> Transportation and storage facilities were barely able to meet last winter's demand. It is estimated that during the coming year these demands will be 14 percent higher.

He further went on to state that the normal production of barges, trucks, and tankers will be retarded because of the steel shortages and, consequently, will cause a shortage in transportation facilities.

The rapid closing of the inlet has seriously endangered the lives and properties of those who have to pass through the inlet under these adverse conditions.

RESCUE WORK OF COAST GUARD HAMPERED

Furthermore, the rescue work of the Coast Guard and the cost of its operations have greatly increased.

Captain Roundtree's record of vessels which have run aground during the last 3 years shows approximately 20 in each of the years 1949 and 1950, compared to only 5 in 1948. This very conclusively indicates the effect which the shoaling of the channel has had on the navigability.

Reducing the number of Coast Guard assists would certainly cut the cost of operating this service and would result in a saving to the Federal Government.

But these statistics do not give the full story, because the Coast Guard's records do not show the hundreds of commercial fishing vessels which have had to have help from private sources.

Petroleum shipments through the inlet dropped from 13 million gallons in 1949 to 1 million gallons in 1950, due to the condition of the inlet. If this trend continues, not only will the cost of living rise in this area, but also there will be a shortage of fuel and other petroleum products, especially during emergencies and cold weather.

An adequate supply of gasoline and oil is vital to the operation of the industries, the Army Air bases, such as at Westhampton Airport, and the safety and the health of the residents of this area.

The Federal Government originally constructed a jetty which it thought would prevent the inlet from shoaling, but the severe storm of 1950 caused certain currents, which deposited their sands in the inlet.

AUTHORIZED AMOUNT FOR CHANNEL

The Army engineers, in their report to the Congress, carefully analyzed all of the factors concerning Fire Island influence on the economy of Long Island, and the welfare of its people. The Congress, after due consideration, accepted the Army engineers' recommendations and approved the project for a channel 200 feet wide and 10 feet deep, at a cost of approximately $228,000.

This approval was given during a peacetime period when perhaps little consideration was given to the inlet as a defense project. Now it must be doubly important that the appropriations should be made so that the inlet may be dredged to take its proper place in the defense of the Nation.

We have shown that if the island should be cut off from Manhattan because of the destruction of its bridges, the only means of transportation between Long Island and the mainland will be by means of water.

DEFENSE NEED FOR PROJECT

At present there is not an adequate inlet to the south shore of Long Island to take care of any sizable means of transportation.

In the event of enemy attack, the defense program provides for closing certain highways, and segregating them exclusively for the use of the Armed Forces. This, also, will vitally affect the mobility of civilians and their supplies, unless additional channels of transportation by means of water are made available.

In World War II, the shortage of tankers was responsible for trucking aviation gasoline through the tunnels and over bridges. This was a dangerous and inefficient practice.

If the New York bridges were bombed, adequate supplies of gasoline would not be available for the aircraft plants and the air bases on Long Island.

After careful consideration of all of the factors, this committee feels that an appropriation should be made for dredging the inlet, because, first, it will provide mobility during emergencies; second, it will aid the Coast Guard in serving the ports of the great South Bay during any emergency.

In this connection, Capt. Eugene T. Osborne, former Commander of the United States Coast Guard district extending from Boston, Mass., to Norfolk, Va, made the following statement:

> During the war, we had a sizable fleet of patrol craft known as the inshore patrol, which were assigned to antisubmarine work. These operated out of all of our inlets.
>
> At that time, the inlets were sufficiently deep to permit the use of patrol boats. But, due to storms, erosion, and lack of maintenance, such would not be the case today. It doesn't make sense that we should have to strive so hard for necessary protection.

Consider also, that during the war we had many Army airfields on Long Island. For the protection of the fliers, crash boats were in

constant use throughout our inlets. Today, we could not get through.

Keeping Fire Island Inlet operating during the emergencies and disasters will assure adequate supplies of food, fuels, and medicine.

Sheriff W. C. McCullen, director of the Suffolk County office of civil defense, in his letter of February 26 to this committee, made that very clear. Evacuees by the thousands, food requirements, with very little reserve storage, fuel of all descriptions, medical supplies, emergency clothing—we have the shelter—if motor transportation is disrupted and the railroads are rendered impotent, we must have help from other sources and water-borne supplies would be of inestimable value, for a deep channel will facilitate refueling coastwise vessels.

Keeping the inlet open is vital to the long-term survival of Long Island's natural resources and its people. If the inlet closes, the great South Bay will become a stagnant pond. It will sound the death knell of the industries of the shellfish operators, and the commercial fishermen who sail from the ports of Babylon, Bay Shore, Islip, West Sayville, and Patchoque.

The Woods' Hole Oceanographic Institute clearly pointed this out in its recent report.

Here a $10,000,000 industry is at stake, which is an important source of food supply to the Metropolitan New York area.

The free and unhampered use of Fire Island Inlet is vitally necessary to maintain the economy of the towns of Brookhaven, Islip, Babylon, and their villages. Its industries, with payrolls amounting to $37,000,000, its commerce, its agriculture, all of these are vitally affected, as well as the safety and health of the people.

REASONS FOR FIRE ISLAND INLET CHANNEL

These are the six impelling reasons why the channel through the inlet should be reestablished immediately.

1. To provide mobility.
2. To aid the Coast Guard.
3. To provide access to food, fuels, and medical supplies.
4. To refuel vessels.
5. To safeguard the welfare of Long Island people, and assure survival of their resources.
6. To aid in the national defense.

There is this other very important factor, that a project of this type pays for itself in the increased taxes which the Federal Government will receive if the economy in the area prospers. There may be many other projects which do not pay for themselves, but here is one of vital necessity to the defense of the Nation, to the people of Long Island, and, best of all, it pays for itself.

We feel certain that when you have evaluated all of these factors, you will find your way clear to approve the appropriations for this project so that the work may be started immediately.

Thank you very much for giving our committee this opportunity to present this.

Senator HAYDEN. I would like to ask the Engineers Corps this question:

Do I understand that the difficulty there is the sand drifting along the coast that closed the opening of the inlet? I remember the

testimony taken in prior years. Have you designed a jetty that will completely cure that?

AMOUNT EXPENDED ON EXISTING JETTY

Colonel POTTER. The jetty exists now, Senator, and $594,000 was spent in building that jetty.

This channel has, I believe, stood up pretty well for several years, but the storm in 1950 caused conditions that closed it up.

Senator HAYDEN. Is it just a question of dredging out the channel, or should the jetty be further extended, or should other jetties be built?

DREDGING COSTS OF CHANNEL

Colonel POTTER. Sir, the $228,000 cost for this new authorization will dredge out that channel.

Maintenance work will have to be done on this project as on all of our channels.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Do any vessels go through it now?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir; but only very light draw. The vessels that go through there are mainly noncommercial, or commercial vessels lightly loaded.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Steel, oil, and others, cannot go through?

Colonel POTTER. A large part of that type of traffic cannot go through.

Senator HAYDEN. That is the next question that I wanted to ask, because the oil tankers are getting bigger and bigger. Of course, the more often that a large tanker can come in, quickly unload, and go back, the more trips it can make in a year, which result in cheaper delivery of fuel.

Is this a 10-foot channel?

Colonel POTTER. A 14-foot channel is approved, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. Is that sufficient to accommodate the larger tankers?

Colonel POTTER. No, sir. The very large tankers, Senator, are generally from refinery to major distribution areas. Many times you will find smaller tankers, 20 feet, 15 feet, or even 10 feet, serving a very useful purpose in distributing oil from major centers to minor inlet ports.

Senator HAYDEN. That is the situation here.

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir; this is one of those places.

Senator HAYDEN. And you believe that a 14-foot channel would suffice?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. And how long would it take to do the work?

Colonel POTTER. The work could be done in one season, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. In any season of the year?

Colonel POTTER. No, sir. It is best to be done in the calmer season. We would not do it in January, for instance.

Senator HAYDEN. I am thinking of when this money becomes available, how soon you can go to work. Can you do anything with it this fall, or would it have to wait until after next winter?

Colonel POTTER. On the assumption that this appropriation bill would be passed in October——

Senator HAYDEN. I am hoping it will be passed before that.

Colonel POTTER. Well, September, then, or August. If it were passed in August, we could probably get the major part of this project done this fall. It would have to be a bid job, sir. We would bid it out. I think we would get very good bids. The dredging industry is a little hungry at this time in this area.

Senator HAYDEN. That is the next question, about the facilities of getting a large dredging outfit to go in there and do a job.

Colonel POTTER. There is plenty of dredging available at this time.

Chairman MCKELLAR. What was the amount you mentioned just now?

Colonel POTTER. It will cost $228,000, sir.

DREDGING OPERATIONS PLANNED

Mr. MULLER. As an operator of those tankers down there, the thing that bothers us the most right now is 150 feet of sand when we head straight in to the beach and turn and go along the beach into the inlet.

Say this appropriation went through in October. If they could get that 150 feet of sand and open a channel for us, we could serve, while they do the rest of the work, and load our tankers much deeper, and satisfy the petroleum administration in keeping those tankers full.

They want us to pick up a 4,000,000 capacity down there and want us to keep them full all summer, and, of course, during the winter, it is a rather difficult job going in there in the wintertime. We have to have the tide and wind and everything favorable. If this short stretch of 150 feet was taken out of the way, we would have 40 percent efficiency in our favor.

Chairman MCKELLAR. May I ask you this: Supposing you dredged out this area this fall, say, the first of October, or the 15th of September, and maybe you can do it in the fall, would it tend to fill up?

Colonel POTTER. The winter storms would undoubtedly shoal it up, sir. We would normally dredge this with a 2-foot overdepth, it being in sand.

I would presume, sir, this would be a maintenance-every-3-years project.

We have some projects that we maintain every 2 years, and some every 3 years. In this particular location, I think that maintenance every 3 years ought to be sufficient.

Senator ECTON. How long has it been since there was maintenance work done?

Colonel POTTER. There was no authorized dredged channel, sir, and that is why this thing comes under the heading of a new start.

ESTIMATED YEARLY MAINTENANCE COSTS OF PROPOSED CHANNEL

The channel is a new authorization. I believe that about every third year, we would have to go in, and spend in the neighborhood of $20,000 to $30,000 for maintenance on this project.

Senator HAYDEN. That would be about 10 percent of the cost?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir. The 150 feet which was mentioned may have to be a hopper-dredge job. I am not sufficiently informed to

know. With a hopper dredge, it could be done more easily at any time of the year, as against a suction-type line dredge.

Senator HAYDEN. What becomes of the dredged material?

Colonel POTTER. We would put it down current, sir. The current generally goes in one direction along these costs, and we would distribute it down current so it would not tend to come back in.

Senator HAYDEN. You mean put it in a barge and take it out and dump it, or could it be pumped to shore?

Colonel POTTER. It could be pumped into a part of the bay where the current would tend to take it away from the channel.

In a hopper dredge, we load the material in the boat and then take the boat out to a dumping area and then dump it.

PERCENTAGE OF CONTRACTS PUT OUT TO BID

Chairman MCKELLAR. What percent of your contracts, in general, are asking for bids?

Colonel POTTER. On the east coast, sir? On navigation projects?

Chairman MCKELLAR. We will take all of your work.

Colonel POTTER. On all of our projects, if you will exclude the hired-labor work we do on the Missouri and Mississippi, where we have large hired-labor crews, I would say that we run in the neighborhood of 90 to 95 percent.

Chairman MCKELLAR. On bids?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir; that is, on civil works projects. But we do have very large hired-labor crews on the Mississippi and on the Missouri Rivers, where the kind of work we do is not easily adaptable to bid jobs.

Senator HAYDEN. You started in answering a situation on the Atlantic coast. Are there plenty of bidders there?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. The percentage would be higher?

Colonel POTTER. It would be close to 100 percent, I believe, except on hopper dredge work, since the Government is the only agency that owns hopper dredges. Suction jobs are generally let out.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Are there any other questions, gentlemen? Are there any other witnesses?

Mr. WEEKS. I want to release my time to the president of the chamber of commerce, Mr. Peter V. Snyder, and two of our supervisors from Long Island, who have just flown up this morning to speak a word.

STATEMENT OF PETER V. SNYDER, PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, PATCHOGUE, LONG ISLAND

FIRE ISLAND INLET CHANNEL PROJECT, NEW YORK

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to say one thing to the committee. One of the 15 villages that Mr. Weiss was talking about is the village in which I reside, and the chamber of commerce of which I am president.

It may have occurred to one or more of you that this thing, being as important to us as we say it is, to wonder how much money we have put into it ourselves in the past.

The Army engineers' report—and this report dates back a few years—states that up to that time local governments and local persons had put $4,300,000 into improving Great South Bay. It is just the channels and harbors of that bay. There is no other access to that bay, through no other inlet can you get into Great South Bay, except this one.

Therefore, having spent that money, and having helped the Government with this jetty, to the tune of about $95,000, I believe we feel that we have put a great deal into it.

We do not now like to see the investment of that many years' standing go by the board.

One other small note in this rather lugubrious picture I would now like to recite to the committee.

I stopped in on the 10th of July to see the chief who runs the Fire Island Coast Guard station, and I asked him how many rescues he made last year in that area.

He said, "One hundred and ninety-nine." That would be from July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951.

This being July 10, I said, "How many have you made in the current year, dating from July 1?"

He said, "Twenty."

So he is going at the rate now of two a day.

So I asked him, I said, "Well, Chief, what do you think of the situation in the inlet?"

He looked me in the eye and said, "Mr. Snyder, it stinks." So, if you will pardon the language, gentlemen, that comes from a man who works there and has to take the people out of the water when they run into the sand bars.

CONSTRUCTION IN PRIOR YEARS AT FIRE ISLAND INLET

Senator YOUNG. How has this inlet been taken care of in the past?

Mr. SNYDER. The colonel told you that the 5,000-foot jetty was built, it was started in 1939, I think, and finished in 1941, just before the war.

The idea behind that was to stop the sand, as the Senator was talking about, from drifting from east to west across the inlet.

It was thought at the time—and I think the Army engineers' report bears me out—that the breakwater or the jetty would not be the final answer, that there would have to be some dredging behind it to maintain a channel.

The next dredging that occurred after the construction of this jetty, was dredging which was done, I believe, by the State of New York or the county of Suffolk, one of the two, or probably both. They put a dredge out there and dredged the channel. That is the only dredging that was done since the jetty was built.

The sand which they took from that dredging was placed on the beach over a short distance, which had eroded. So they were killing two birds with one stone; that is all that has happened.

Senator YOUNG. Why is the State of New York not doing anything now? I am just trying to get the thing straight in my mind.

Mr. SNYDER. They have been doing nothing, sir, since the original engineers' report recommended that Congress do something about it.

When the House of Representatives did pass it in their bill, the

State just sat there. In other words, they say: "We have all of this authorization, all of this planning, all of this work that has to be done. We have a report by competent engineers saying that it should be done this way. There it is."

We are sitting there, hoping that it can be built. As I understand it, Senator—and perhaps the colonel will correct me when I sit down—the general current along the beach, and there are 135 miles of beach from Montauk Point to New York, is from east to west.

The island runs east and west, almost due east and west, so it runs almost the whole length, even if the wind is from the south.

It takes the sand from the east end and pushes it to the west end.

If you will remember that picture of Fire Island, you will notice that instead of the inlet going at north and south, it comes in at an angle, because this Point Democrat keeps sliding further and further toward New York.

The original lighthouse which was on the point in the 1880's is now 4½ miles from the end of the point. So we have had a 4½-mile build-up in that time.

We have dredged behind it on occasion, and everything would be O. K. It would be all right, but nobody is bothering doing the dredging after spending a half million dollars building the jetty.

We think now after the Government spending that money in it, and the local population, that, by this expenditure of a comparatively small amount, we can keep the thing going.

If we do not do anything now, the feeling is that in 4 or 5 years the thing will be closed and the people will then wake up. Then it will be much more expensive than if we catch it now.

The sand has been drifting for a hundred years, and I guess it will keep going that way.

Thank you very much, gentlemen, for your time.

STATEMENT OF PHILIP HATTIMER, SUPERVISOR, TOWN OF BROOKHAVEN, LONG ISLAND

FIRE ISLAND INLET CHANNEL PROJECT, NEW YORK

Mr. HATTIMER. There are 10 towns in Suffolk County, and the 3 towns that are vitally effected are Brookhaven town, Islip town, and Babylon town.

Babylon town is really the home of Fire Island Inlet, but Supervisor Walter could not be here today, and neither could another supervisor of Islip, but I am going to speak in their behalf.

First I want to say that I back up 100 percent the facts and figures that Mr. Weiss has given you today. I probably can give you a little sidelight on perhaps a small amount of dredging that was done in 1945, which was done through the cooperation of the State of New York, the town of Babylon, and the county of Suffolk.

There is in that inlet, on the inside of the inlet, a place called Oak Beach. They had a very serious beach erosion problem, and it was only on account of that beach erosion problem that the State of New York contributed 50 percent, about a $200,000 project to pump that sand out and throw it up on Oak Beach.

Other than that, there has not been any dredging done in Fire Island Inlet.

I have stood on Fire Island Jetty—and it is filled out, practically, to the end. When we get these heavy storms, it does spill over.

DRIFTING SANDS AT MOUTH OF INLET

As Mr. Snyder told you, the prevailing storm winds do the most damage when blowing from the east, and that sand spills over. That is where the trouble is, at the mouth of the inlet, not inside.

Another reason I would like to point out is that, as a member of the board of supervisors, we have been seriously handicapped since the 1938 hurricane with a beach erosion problem on this barrier beach that has been mentioned.

It is only through special legislation that the State of New York passed this legislation whereby they would contribute 50 percent and the county 25 percent and the various towns 25 percent, that front along Fire Island beach. Up to this time, there has been over $2,000,000 spent on beach erosion, and it is for small communities.

The population in my town is 44,000. The population of Islip town is 70,000, and the population of Babylon town is around 45,000. That represents about 160,000 population out of the county's 272,000.

The burden of this beach erosion has fallen on these three towns, although the other towns are contributing in a small share toward it.

I urgently ask that your honorable committee give this matter of dredging Fire Island Inlet every consideration.

Thank you very much.

Senator ECTON. Let me ask you a question: Did any of you men appear before the House Appropriations Committee this year?

Mr. HATTIMER. This year? Yes, our committee appeared before the House.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Is there another witness?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Joseph B. Kelly, supervisor of the town of Riverhead. Mr. Kelly and Mr. Hattimer represented the Board of Supervisors of Suffolk County.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH B. KELLY, SUPERVISOR, TOWN OF RIVERHEAD, LONG ISLAND

FIRE ISLAND INLET CHANNEL, N. Y.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished Senators, first of all, on behalf of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Suffolk, I want to express to you our appreciation for the opportunity of this committee meeting before you today, and expressing itself in an appeal on behalf of the Fire Island Inlet.

Also on behalf of the board, I want to express our appreciation to Senator Lehman and Senator Ives, and also to our Congressman Greenwood, for the splendid cooperation that they have given us.

I would like you men to know—and I am not a bit facetious in making this remark, I assure you that my fellow supervisor, Philip Hattimer, is a member of the Republican Party, one of the two great parties in the United States, and I am a member of the Democratic Party, that is, the other great party in the United States. The fact that we are both here is an indication that, as far as the Board of

Supervisors of the County of Suffolk is concerned, this is not in the slightest degree smelling of anything that might be accused of being purely political.

Now, both of our political parties are very much interested in the dredging of Fire Island Inlet and the maintenance of that inlet. It means a great deal to us.

Senator ECTON. I take it that neither one of you considered that this comes under "pork barrel" legislation?

Mr. KELLY. I think that is right, sir. I think a very capable presentation has been made. If I would make any other comment, it simply would be a repetition of what has been said.

I want you men to know that the county of Suffolk is vitally interested in this project, and it would be very grateful to you men if you could see your way clear to recommend it for us.

Senator YOUNG. May I ask Colonel Potter a question?

Colonel Potter, I suppose it was turned down mainly on the ground that it was a new start?

Did the House call it a new start?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir; it was not in the budget, Senator.

Senator YOUNG. Had you made a request to the Bureau of the Budget?

Colonel POTTER. No, sir; we had not. We had a hard time fitting the projects already under construction into our budget this year.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Are there any other witnesses?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, could I add a word of my own?

Senator Ecton does not know that he wrote me a letter 2 or 3 days ago, and we did appreciate his thought. This is not a "pork barrel" proposition. As the Senator expressed in his letter—and we appreciated it—it is vital defense matter, and we hope that you will consider it as such.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Are there any other witnesses? Are there any questions? Then, may I, at this point in the record, have inserted a letter from the Long Island Association in regard to the Fire Island Inlet project?

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

THE LONG ISLAND ASSOCIATION,
Garden City, Long Island, N. Y., July 16, 1951.

Re Fire Island Inlet appropriations.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the committee of ports and waterways of the Long Island Association and the special Fire Lsland Inlet committee, we are appealing to you for aid in securing an appropriation for the improvement of Fire Island Inlet, Suffolk County, Long Island.

This improvement was authorized by the Board of River and Harbor Engineers May 17, 1950, at an estimated cost of $228,000, extending and maintaining a channel 200 feet wide at depth of 10 feet mean low water. No appropriation was made in the 1950–51 Federal budget nor is it included at this time in the 1951–52 budget.

Our reasons for making this appeal to you are as follows:

(1) Fire Island Inlet has so shoaled up that navigation is extremely difficult, dangerous, and costly. Fuel oil and gasoline shipments through the inlet prior to November 1950 averaged 1,103,690 gallons per month. Since the November hurricane of 1950, the shipments through the inlet have been reduced to 420,000 gallons per month. This will be proven by the various shipping lines using the inlet.

(2) Commercial fishing boats plying this inlet have been unable to get through the inlet on many occasions. This will be fully substantiated by the Long Island Fishermen's Association.

(3) The whole economy of the towns of Brookhaven, Islip, Babylon, and their villages is directly affected by the free and unhampered use of Fire Island Inlet. In this area the manufacturing payrolls amount to $37,000,000 annually, of which at the present time payrolls totaling at least $29,000,000 are concerned with war defense production. The reduction of fuel oil and gasoline shipments through Fire Island Inlet has created an increased cost throughout this area due to the necessity of trucking petroleum products from the west and from the north shore.

(4) The entire economy of this area is also vitally affected by the conditions of the water in the Great South Bay due to the reduced volume of tidal circulation through Fire Island Inlet seriously affecting shellfish culture and creating pollution in the bay. The range of tidal flow has been reduced by at least 50 percent. This will be fully demonstrated by a report of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, which discloses very startling results. In 1950 the area population was 159,130. The summer population adds nearly 100,000 people. Therefore, it is vitally important to the economy of the entire Great South Bay area that a good flow of water be maintained through Fire Island Inlet.

(5–1) The director of civil defense for the county of Suffolk has prepared a complete statement with reference to the great importance of Fire Island Inlet to the defense program of two-thirds of the area of Long Island. Not only is the complete and safe navigability of Fire Island Inlet necessary for both civil and military defense of Suffolk County, but in cases of disaster to the bridge and tunnel connections with Manhattan and the mainland, Fire Island Inlet would be the only access from the Atlantic Ocean to the entire south shore of Long Island.

(5–2) Thirty-five percent of the population of the State of New York is now concentrated on Long Island. In reality its entire coast line is a defense area. From East Rockaway Inlet at Atlantic Beach to Montauk Point, (100 miles), the only possible inlet for war or civil defense is Fire Island Inlet. In case of disaster on land or sea this inlet absolutely must be made and kept navigable.

Fire Island Inlet is a Government project on which $870,000 was expended for a jetty in 1941. No appropriations have been made to date for maintenance of the channel. Is the Federal Government now going to revoke its direct obligation to maintain an adequate and safe channel?

Very truly yours,

MEADE C. DOBSON, *Managing Director.*

DISCUSSION OF SELECTED RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Colonel Potter a few questions, if I may.

Colonel Potter, a few days ago, you had prepared some figures for for me on the various projects. Do you have a copy of this?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir; I have a copy.

Senator YOUNG. Regarding Gavins Point project. That would be a new start, would it?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Senator YOUNG. That was approved by the budget. Was it requested by the Defense Establishment for power?

Colonel POTTER. The Corps of Engineers requested the Gavins Point project and the President included it in his budget.

Senator YOUNG. On the basis of power?

Colonel POTTER. Partly power, sir; and also due to the fact that until Gavins Point is constructed, the Fort Randall project cannot be operated as a peaking plant as designed. The Fort Randall Dam will be closed next year.

Senator YOUNG. How long will it take to complete?

Colonel POTTER. About 4 or 5 years, sir.

Senator YOUNG. And what would be the cost per kilowatt?

Colonel POTTER. I would like to furnish that information for the record, sir.

(The information requested appears on following page.)

Senator YOUNG. I would like to discuss these other so-called new starts, for which there was a budget estimate.

On the next page, on "Rivers and harbors, The Dalles lock and dam."

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Senator YOUNG. Let me ask you: What happened to Oahe Dam? Why was that not listed here?

Colonel POTTER. Oahe Dam is already under construction, sir. It is not a new start.

Senator YOUNG. It was deleted by the House.

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Senator YOUNG. How many others are in the same category as Oahe?

Colonel POTTER. Six others, sir, which were deleted by the House. These were going projects that had continuing contracts in force.

Senator YOUNG. Would you make a similar recapitulation of those projects?

Colonel POTTER. That is already in the record, sir.

Senator YOUNG. Let me ask: Concerning The Dalles, how long would it take to construct that?

Colonel POTTER. It would take about 7 years of appropriations, sir. Power would go on the line in November of 1956.

Senator YOUNG. And you will finish that cost per kilowatt, will you?

Colonel POTTER. I will do that.

Senator YOUNG. All of these projects were approved by the executive department on the basis of power shortage, is that right?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Senator YOUNG. Is that true of the Tennessee Old Hickory lock and dam?

Colonel POTTER. The power from Old Hickory lock and dam is necessary in the TVA area. The power from that project would be distributed by TVA.

Senator YOUNG. Would you furnish the cost per kilowatt?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Senator YOUNG. And also the Washington project, Ice Harbor lock and dam.

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Senator YOUNG. Also all the other so-called new starts for which there was a Bureau of the Budget estimate, would that include the New Jersey project?

Colonel POTTER. On which page?

Senator YOUNG. On the last page. I think I have covered all on the second page, have I not?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Senator YOUNG. Are there any new starts on the back page? I think I have covered them all on the second page.

Colonel POTTER. On the third page, those are all new starts, sir. They were not allowed by the Bureau of the Budget.

Senator YOUNG. All right, then. Will you furnish the same information for them that I have requested of all the others.

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

(The information requested is as follows:)

Power installation schedules and cost of power for selected projects

Project and location	Installation, initial kilowatts	Construction period (first power), years	Schedule of installation	Cost per kilowatt-hour (mills) [1]
Gavins Point Reservoir, Nebr. and S. Dak.	100,000	4¾	April 1956—33,300 kilowatts August 1956—33,300 kilowatts October 1956—33,300 kilowatts	[2] 3.0
Old Hickory Lock and Dam, Tenn.	100,000	2¾	March 1954—25,000 kilowatts June 1954—25,000 kilowatts October 1954—25,000 kilowatts January 1955—25,000 kilowatts	5.2
The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash.	980,000	15¼	November 1956—140,000 kilowatts (remaining 12 units at rate of 1 each 3 months).	2.6
Ice Harbor Lock and Dam, Wash.	195,000	4½	December 1955—130,000 kilowatts. March 1956—65,000 kilowatts	3.0
Albeni Falls Dam, Idaho	42,600	[3] 3¼	August 1954—14,200 kilowatts December 1954—14,200 kilowatts. April 1955—14,200 kilowatts	1.6
Buford Dam, Ga	86,000	4¾	December 1955—40,000 kilowatts. March 1956—40,000 kilowatts. June 1956—6,000 kilowatts	[4] 10.0
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak	170,000	10	1959—170,000 kilowatts	3.3

[1] These costs are based on preliminary cost allocations and are approximate. It should be noted that the cost per kilowatt-hour of energy generated at hydroelectric plants is not a true measure of the power benefits nor accurate for use in comparing with the benefits to be derived from another project. The benefits from a hydro project accrue from both the energy generated (kilowatt-hours produced) and from kilowatts of capacity installed to supply loads.

Projects of the Corps of Engineers are designed to fit into the load requirements of a particular system to be served by the project. As such, a plant with a high energy cost per kilowatt-hour may provide much greater annual benefits to its power system than some other plant which produces energy at a lower cost.

[2] Without allowance of appropriate part of $4,800,000 in power benefits at Fort Randall which results from the operation of Gavins Point.

[3] Storage for increase in power at downstream plants scheduled for August 1952 which is 2 years prior to installation of power facilities at site.

[4] Based only on energy produced at site with no allowance made for power benefits at existing and planned downstream projects.

PAINTED ROCK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, GILA RIVER, ARIZ.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Is there anything further?

Senator HAYDEN. I would like to ask the colonel a question or two with respect to the Painted Rock Reservoir on the Gila River, which, as I understand it, is authorized for construction, based upon a treaty with the Republic of Mexico.

I might explain to the committee that the Gila River is not often in flood, but when we do have floods on that stream, they sometimes are terrific.

It was a flood that came down the Gila and not the Colorado River water that broke the levees.

The reason for the damage done by the Gila in a flood is that the flood may occur, or will occur, always in the wintertime, whereas the normal rise of the Colorado River is in the summer from the melting of snow. The Colorado River bed at Yuma, and in that area, gradually spreads out as the water gradually rises in the main stream. Then, as the floods go down, the river bed fills up again with gravel

and other grit, but the result, if a winter flood comes down the Gila, there is no place for it to go except to spread out and break the levees, as it has done before.

MEXICAN WATER TREATY FLOOD-CONTROL PROVISIONS

In the treaty with Mexico, relating to a division of the water of the Colorado River, the Mexican Government agreed to construct a dam across the Colorado River, below Yuma, half in the United States and half in Mexico. It is known as the Morelos Dam. That dam has been completed.

There is a levee system that protects the 75,000 acres of highly cultivated lands in the Yuma area. Those levees are sufficient, under normal conditions. But, if a Gila flood came down, those levees would break.

There is also the danger of breaking the dam. For that reason, the treaty provides that there must be a detention there to take the peak of the flood.

That is the proposal that I want to talk about. Now, as I understand, no work of any kind has been done upon it. What I would like to find out is whether there is anything in this year's budget.

Colonel POTTER. There is nothing in this year's budget for this project.

Senator HAYDEN. Now, can you tell me about when the project was authorized and how, if you will?

Colonel POTTER. The project was authorized in the 1950 omnibus bill which was passed last May, Senator. We requested $75,000 in this year's budget, to initiate planning. With that amount of money, we could get started on the planning of the engineering details of the project. No other funds have been requested by us for this project which, if constructed, would protect 360,000 acres of land downstream from Painted Rock.

TOTAL COST OF PAINTED ROCK PROJECT

The cost of this project is $25,800,000. The capacity would be about 2,400,000 acre-feet, which is a rather substantial capacity.

Senator HAYDEN. It is not designed as an irrigation reservoir, it is strictly for flood control?

Colonel POTTER. Strictly for flood control, and designed specifically against the very severe type of flash floods that you have in your country, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. What really ought to be done, if we could do it, is to allow you a sufficient sum of money to commence.

Colonel POTTER. That is right, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. And that is all you want at the present time?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir; we could profitably use planning money on this project this year.

Senator HAYDEN. Is there anything further you want to add to your statement?

Colonel POTTER. No, sir; I believe that sufficiently covers it. This item is an integral part of the plan developed as a result of the treaty of 1944 with Mexico.

Senator HAYDEN. Was there any time limit under that treaty, as to when the dam was to be built?

Colonel POTTER. I do not know, sir. I believe the State Department would be able to give you that answer, or I could get the treaty and look it up for you.

OBLIGATIONS UNDER MEXICAN WATER TREATY

Senator HAYDEN. I suggest that you place in the record what kind of an obligation we made by treaty with the Republic of Mexico that requires fulfillment and when it must be done.

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

(The information referred to is as follows:)

FLOOD-CONTROL PROVISIONS OF MEXICAN WATER TREATY

Article 12 (a) of the treaty of February 3, 1944, between the United States and Mexico requires Mexico to construct a diversion dam on the lower Colorado River. This structure has been completed and is known as the Morelos diversion dam. It is located in the international reach of the Colorado River about 1 mile below the point where the northernmost part of the international land boundary intersects the Colorado River.

Article 12 (a) of the treaty also provides that (italics supplied):

"Regardless of where such diversion structure is located, there shall *simultaneously* be constructed such levees, interior drainage facilities and other works, or improvements to existing works, as in the opinion of the Commission shall be necessary to protect lands within the United States against damage from such floods and seepage as might result from the construction, operation, and maintenance of this diversion structure. These protective works shall be constructed, operated, and maintained at the expense of Mexico by the respective sections of the Commission, or under their supervision, each within the territory of its own country."

The United States and Mexico have agreed on the necessary flood-control works, relating to the Morelos diversion dam, which should be constructed. This agreement is set forth in Minute No. 195, adopted May 6, 1950, which was subsequently approved by the Governments of the United States and of Mexico. The agreement contemplates two increments of levee-construction work: First, that necessary even without the Morelos Dam, for which the United States is responsible, and second, that necessitated by the Morelos Dam, for which Mexico is responsible.

Studies of flood conditions on the lower Gila River and the Colorado River which were developed by the Bureau of Reclamation in collaboration with the United States Section of the Commission showed that a levee system bordering these rivers would have to be able to withstand a design flood of 310,000 second-feet in the event that the Painted Rock Dam were not constructed, or a design flood of 140,000 second-feet with the Painted Rock Dam constructed. After the construction of the Painted Rock Dam was authorized and in keeping with the international agreement set forth in Minute No. 195 of the Commission, the Bureau of Reclamation prepared plans for the construction of a levee system upstream from the Morelos diversion dam capable of containing a design flood of 140,000 second-feet at Yuma, Ariz. This assumes that the Painted Rock Dam will be constructed, if possible, simultaneously with the levees.

A contract for construction of these levees has been awarded by the Bureau of Reclamation. With respect to the Mexican increment, the work is under the supervisory control of the United States Section of the Commission. Mexico has established an advance credit of $2,000,000 for its share and if United States funds are available to carry the work forward as now scheduled, the construction will be completed by the end of fiscal year 1953.

Since this flood protection work is proceeding on the assumption that the Painted Rock Dam will be constructed, it is vitally important that this structure be completed, or at least sufficiently far advanced by the time the levee work is finished, to safely contain any future floods which would endanger the developed areas along the lower reaches of the Gila and Colorado Rivers.

Further, article 13 of the water treaty of 1944 provides that the International Boundary and Water Commission shall prepare plans for flood control on the lower Colorado River between Imperial Dam and the Gulf of California. This article reads as follows:

"The Commission shall study, investigate and prepare plans for flood control on the lower Colorado River between Imperial Dam and the Gulf of California, in both the United States and Mexico, and shall, in a minute, report to the two Governments the works which should be built, the estimated cost thereof, and the part of the works to be constructed by each Government. The two Governments agree to construct, through their respective sections of the Commission, such works as may be recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments, each Government to pay the costs of the works constructed by it. The Commission shall likewise recommend the parts of the works to be operated and maintained jointly by the Commission and the parts to be operated and maintained by each section. The two Governments agree to pay in equal shares the cost of joint operation and maintenance, and each Government agrees to pay the cost of operation and maintenance of the works assigned to it for such purpose."

The studies and investigations by the Joint Commission preliminary to the preparation of plans are well advanced. The Governments of the United States and Mexiso have instructed the Commission to complete its report and recommendations as soon as possible. The Department is informed that the Commission is formulating its plans on the basis that the Painted Rock Dam will be constructed.

In summation, while the Painted Rock flood-control dam on the Gila River is not specifically required by the water treaty of 1944, nevertheless, the structure is very important to the international flood-control works which are being constructed and planned on the lower Colorado River.

Painted Rock Dam should be constructed as soon as possible because of its effect on the levee work upstream from the Morelos diversion dam. The treaty of 1944 stipulates that this levee work must be done simultaneously with the construction of the Morelos Dam. This dam is already completed and Mexico is pressing to fulfill her obligation in the consruction of the necessary levee work.

FALCON DAM PROJECT

Colonel POTTER. The Falcon Dam is being built by the Bureau of Reclamation for the International Border Commission, and was started last year. For the size of the dam, I would say it is about a 3-year job, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. Well, that is a totally different matter. That dam was also probably provided for in the Mexican water treaties, because the waters dealt with in the treaty are the waters of the Rio Grande and the waters of the Colorado and its tributaries.

Chairman MCKELLAR. How many organizations are building dams?

Colonel POTTER. The Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Soil Conservation Service, which builds very small dams, mostly farm pond types, and the Corps of Engineers.

Chairman MCKELLAR. The TVA does not build dams, does it?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. They build dams?

Colonel POTTER. They build some quite large dams, sir, and a great many of them, on the Tennessee River and its tributaries only.

Chairman MCKELLAR. If my recollection is correct, the dams built on the Tennessee, the first one built was Muscle Shoals.

Colonel POTTER. We built that.

Chairman MCKELLAR. And you built the Chickamauga?

Colonel POTTER. Chickamauga, in Kentucky, and other dams were built by the TVA, sir.

Chairman McKellar. Does the TVA obtain appropriations from the Congress and pay into the Treasury itself?

Colonel Potter. Yes, sir; under the conditions of the TVA Act.

Chairman McKellar. The conditions of the TVA Act—what do they provide?

Colonel Potter. Every year they get an appropriation, I believe, sir, that normally they come in and request appropriations for certain projects. I do remember when they came in for Kentucky Dam, for instance.

OLD HICKORY DAM, TENN.

Chairman McKellar. What is the situation in regard to Old Hickory Dam now?

Colonel Potter. Old Hickory Dam, on the Cumberland, will be built by the Corps of Engineers.

Chairman McKellar. What is the status of that dam now?

Colonel Potter. We have spent in the neighborhood of a quarter of a million dollars for planning, and we have requested, and have, in the President's budget, enough funds to start construction on that dam.

Chairman McKellar. What happened to it?

Colonel Potter. The House eliminated it.

Chairman McKellar. Do you have a budget estimate?

Colonel Potter. We have a budget estimate.

Chairman McKellar. On the old approval?

Colonel Potter. Yes, sir; the work is fully authorized. The estimate was submitted based on our knowledge that this power is very necessary in the TVA system. We have had several conferences with them where they have repeatedly said that the power from Old Hickory and the other dams on the Cumberland River should come in on a certain specific schedule. Their contemplated load growth will put them in a position where their surplus is not enough to carry them with safety through the large defense loads that they must carry within the next 2 or 3 years.

Senator Ecton. Do they not have steam plants to supplement that?

Colonel Potter. They have steam plants to supplement that, sir, but in their over-all schedule, those steam plants have a place. Our projects for Old Hickory, Celina, Wolf Creek, and the rest of those that are either finished or under construction, have their place in the integrated plan of the TVA.

Chairman McKellar. You build them and turn them over to the TVA for operation?

Colonel Potter. Only the power is turned over to TVA for distribution.

Chairman McKellar. Do you operate them?

Colonel Potter. Yes, sir; we operate the dams.

Chairman McKellar. That was my understanding.

GARRISON DAM PROJECT, NORTH DAKOTA

INDIAN AGENCY FACILITIES

Senator Young. How much, Colonel Potter, of the amount requested for Garrison project do you propose to use for the reestab-

lishment of the Indian agency and facilities, including roads and bridges?

Colonel POTTER. None will be expended for that in the 1952 fiscal year funds.

Senator YOUNG. When do you propose to start the relocation of these Government facilities?

Colonel POTTER. Probably in fiscal year 1953 or as soon thereafter as the necessary agreement for the relocations can be reached with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Senator YOUNG. Is this in keeping with your usual policy on other similar projects?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

STEWARTS FERRY PROJECT, TENNESSEE

Chairman MCKELLAR. How about Stewarts Ferry?

Colonel POTTER. We are ready to go into construction on Stewarts Ferry. Our planning is far enough along, sir, that we can get into construction the minute we get construction money.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Did you recommend to the budget for that?

Colonel POTTER. There was an estimate submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. We requested $2,000,000 to start construction. We have already expended $592,600 on planning.

Chairman MCKELLAR. And the total cost of that dam will be $19,000,000 is it?

Colonel POTTER. That is right, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Let me ask you: Is that a multiple-purpose dam? Is that a flood-control dam?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir; the project provides for flood-control, power, and stream regulation.

CHEATHAM DAM, TENN.

Chairman MCKELLAR. What about the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland?

Colonel POTTER. On the Cheatham Dam, we have a continuing contract in force, for the construction of the lock and lock machinery. The amount of money that has already been appropriated is $3,636,500. Our appropriation last year was $2,050,000. We requested $3,000,000 of the Bureau of the Budget, and the President's budget included $3,000,000 to continue that contract for the construction of the locks.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Will that complete the dam?

Colonel POTTER. No, sir; that will not even complete the locks. That will leave about $8,000,000 still to come. The House eliminated the item and we are somewhat in a quandary as to how we can treat that continuing contract, if no money is made available this year.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Is there a budget estimate for it?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. And they have recommended it?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. There is no reason why it should not be put in this bill, is there?

Colonel POTTER. Sir, we have placed a statement in the record requesting restoration for that item and explaining exactly why the sum is necessary, in order to carry on the work.

Senator HAYDEN. You say "a continuing contract." That is to say, there is a contractor on the job who took the contract with the understanding that it would be subject to appropriations by the Congress?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Senator HAYDEN. But if Congress failed to appropriate any money in any one year, would he be entitled to damages for moving on the job, and then would it cost more to come back on it again?

Colonel POTTER. If we received no appropriations, sir, under the terms of a paragraph which may have to be included in the specifications, we would have to pay him his mobilization and demobilization charges and profit on the work that he has done.

Chairman MCKELLAR. If work is stopped, what would it cost the Government?

Colonel POTTER. I do not know, but it might be as much as one-third of our estimate for 1952.

Senator HAYDEN. That is why I asked the question, Mr. Chairman. It looked to me to be a serious matter.

When you have a reliable contractor on the job, and he is ready to go ahead, he has worked for a period of time in the past, and is ready to proceed with the work, and he has equipment there, and he has his men trained to do the work, and then you cut off the appropriation, you have to pay him the damages that the colonel has outlined here.

Then, ultimately, you will take it up again, and have to let a new contract, and probably at higher cost, higher unit costs.

BUDGET REQUEST FOR CHEATHAM DAM

Chairman MCKELLAR. In other words, you recommend for this particular dam $3,000,000?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. And the budget estimate was $2,050,000; is that right?

Colonel POTTER. No, sir; the budget estimate was——

Chairman MCKELLAR. That was the House last year. What was the budget estimate?

Colonel POTTER. $3,000,000, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. $3,000,000. Would the Government lose over a third of it if the work is discontinued?

Colonel POTTER. That is my estimate, Senator McKellar.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Is that not very bad business?

Colonel POTTER. It is not only bad business, Senator, but it destroys the faith of the contracting profession in the continuing contract method of doing work.

Chairman MCKELLAR. And it is liable to lead to larger bids, is it not?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir. Let us take this particular case.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Yes; we will—I am very much interested in this.

Colonel POTTER. This lock and dam costs $14,000,000. If we did not have the continuing contract method of doing work, we would

have to receive from the Congress $14,000,000, let a contract to build the locks and dam, putting up this amount of money.

We would know that it would take him 3 to 3½ years to build the dam, and a large part of that $14,000,000 would not be used, and no work could be accomplished with it whatsoever.

On a project like McNary Dam, for instance, we could break that up into three jobs. But I cannot conceive of any contract, unless we have the continuing contract procedure, where we could go ahead with less than $60 or $70 million, a large part of which would not be used for many years until the contractor had finally used it all up.

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT PROVISIONS

Senator ECTON. In that connection, Colonel Potter, is the contractor required to complete his contract under the $14,000,000 agreement, over a period of 3 or 4 years, or whatever it is to run, notwithstanding the fact that all his costs may have increased in the meantime?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Senator ECTON. Is that true?

Colonel POTTER. That is true, sir.

Senator ECTON. There is no adjustment for increased wages or increased materials, or no allowance for inflation under the contract?

Colonel POTTER. That is right for all construction contracts, sir. There is no adjustment in the competitive-bid method of letting work, sir. They all turn in a sealed bid and say, "We will do it for this amount of money."

Senator ECTON. So, if you have to discontinue it, and pay him for his mobilization, his demobilization, then when you come back in and finish at some time in the future, of course, the original contract will be boosted considerably, due to these various conditions; is that correct?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir. If that situation developed, where you had to stop work and then readvertise and bring a new contractor on, you pay for two mobilizations, two demobilizations, plus two contingencies.

I can give one very good example, sir.

KANOPOLIS DAM, KANS.

The Kanopolis Dam was about a third finished when it was stopped in 1942. It was estimated to cost $9,000,000, and we had a contract to build the dam for $9,000,000.

After the war, in 1945 we advertised what was left of Kanopolis, under another contract and the total cost of the project was somewhere in the neighborhood of $12,000,000.

Senator HAYDEN. I can give you just the same kind of illustration with respect to the United States Reclamation Service.

There was a contractor in Utah who came down to build a dam for $55,000,000 before the war. It shut down on account of the war. The total cost of the dam, at the last figure I saw, was $111,000,000, pratcically double, because they were paid their damages for closing down and had to come back again. They left their machinery out there in the weather, all during the 4 years of war, and then when

they came back, with higher wages, higher material costs, all of these other things, the expense was greater.

So the dam, if we had gone ahead with it and finished it up, would have given us the electric power 4 or 5 years sooner and at half the cost.

OAHE DAM, S. DAK.

Senator YOUNG. The Oahe Dam is one of the dams that you started construction on, and, I think, the contractors are now winding up their dirt moving under the present contracts. Is that not correct? I am speaking of the South Dakota dam.

Colonel POTTER. I can state that a continuing contract is in force on that project, sir.

Senator YOUNG. One of the things I wanted to know is: What happened to these contracts now, once they have been finished, their present work, will they have to wait until new appropriations are approved? You will not be able to continue under the continuing resolution, will you?

Colonel POTTER. General Pick, in his opening statement, indicated that he was going to make available to these projects that had continuing contracts, small additional amounts to keep them going until the action of the Senate and the Congress was known.

Senator YOUNG. At Oahe, I understand that the contractors have about finished moving the dirt. When they finish, do they have to wait until this bill passes Congress?

Colonel POTTER. After they use up their money, the money that is available, they can do one of three things: They can go ahead on their own capital until money is available, they can suspend operations, or terminate the contract.

Senator YOUNG. Who takes the risk? Would they take the risk of whether or not Congress later provides more money?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir; if they continue operations.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I will ask you about a third dam in Tennessee, known as Old Hickory Lock and Dam.

What is the situation as to that dam?

OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TENN.

Colonel POTTER. Old Hickory Lock and Dam has a total cost of $49,120,000, sir.

It has 100,000 kilowatts of power. We have allocated $450,000 for planning. We have the generators under design.

Chairman MCKELLAR. You have what?

Colonel POTTER. The generators are under design by a generator manufacturing company. Plans and specifications are sufficiently in shape to start construction. We asked the Bureau of the Budget for $5,000,000 for this project. Because of the importance of the project the Bureau of the Budget increased that to $8,000,000. The House knocked it out.

Chairman MCKELLAR. They knocked it out? Well, would that dam suffer in the same way if it was stopped?

Colonel POTTER. That dam is not started, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I thought you said that you had started the generator design. It is not the generators themselves?

Colonel POTTER. No, sir; just the generator design, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. That is a new project; is it?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir; it is a new start.

Chairman MCKELLAR. But they cut out the other two, in Tennessee?

HOUSE ACTION

Colonel POTTER. They cut out Old Hickory, for which there was a budget estimate. They stopped Cheatham, for which there was a budget estimate. They did not allow the $100,000 planning money for Carthage which was also in the budget.

Chairman MCKELLAR. For Carthage?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. By the way, you said that there would be 100,000 kilowatts of power produced by the Old Hickory project. Just in a general way, what would that sell for?

Colonel POTTER. I suppose that would sell in the neighborhood of about 5 mills in a kilowatt.

DOLLAR POWER BENEFITS

Chairman MCKELLAR. How much in dollars, so I can see what sort of income it would bring to the Government, if built?

Colonel POTTER. The power benefits from this project are about $3,500,000 a year, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. $3,500,000 a year on a $49,000,000 project?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir; that does not include the navigation benefits.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Is Old Hickory just below or just above Nashville?

Colonel POTTER. It is just above.

Chairman MCKELLAR. So Nashville would get the benefit of navigation?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. And the completion of these two dams should make the Cumberland navigable, too, the Cheatham Dam and the dam at Stewarts Ferry; would it not?

Colonel POTTER. Fortunately, sir, there is a 6-foot navigation project on the Cumberland now, but this would provide a 9-foot project, which would allow the Ohio River type of barge to be used all the way up to Nashville.

Chairman MCKELLAR. I was astonished the other day to find out the enormous amounts of heavy freight of all kinds, for that matter, but especially heavy freights, like steel and oil, carried on the Mississippi River. This would permit those heavy freights to be carried as high as Nashville; would it not?

Colonel POTTER. Sir, I was surprised when I visited the city of Nashville last year to find out that even the newspapers there bring their newsprint by barge from Chicago.

Chairman MCKELLAR. They bring their newsprint from Chicago?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir.

Chairman MCKELLAR. All right, gentlemen. We will adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10:30, I believe.

(Justification for restoration for the projects discussed are as follows:)

JUSTIFICATION FOR RESTORATION, MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING RIVER AND HARBOR WORKS

Item No. 27 (p. 127), Buffalo Harbor, N. Y.

Total estimated Federal cost	$16,146,000
Allotments to date	4,623,000
Additional to complete	11,523,000
Approved budget estimate	305,000
Amount allowed by House	----------
Restoration requested	305,000

EFFECT OF REDUCTION

The elimination of funds for the Buffalo Harbor project will delay the realization of benefits from the work proposed in the President's budget until funds for that work are appropriated and will extend the completion date for this important Great Lakes harbor.

JUSTIFICATION FOR RESTORATION

Both items proposed for accomplishment in the fiscal year 1952 budget affect the ease and convenience of navigation utilizing the south outer harbor. The commerce handled in this part of the harbor, which consists principally of iron ore, limestone, and coal, has accounted for approximately 80 percent of such commerce of the past. Over the past 10 years, the total commerce of the port has averaged in excess of 18,000,000 tons annually. Proposed steel-plant expansion costing over $100,000,000, to be completed in 1953, will add over 1,000,000 tons of heavy-bulk commodities to the commerce in this area.

Removal of the shoal areas is required for the safe navigation of large vessels, particularly in rough weather, and has been strongly urged by the navigation committee of the Lake Carriers Association.

Item No. 35 (p. 146). Cheatham Lock and Dam, Tenn.

Total estimated Federal cost	$14,000,000
Allotments to date	3,636,500
Additional to complete	10,363,500
Approved budget estimate	3,000,000
Amount allowed by House	----------
Restoration requested	3,000,000

EFFECT OF REDUCTION

Elimination of the funds for this project will mean suspension or termination of the existing continuing contract for the construction of the lock by September or October of this year. Termination of the lock contract would probably cost the Government between $250,000 and $500,000 depending upon the status of material purchases by the contractor and other factors in effect at the time of termination. Use of the project will be deferred at least 1 year—from 1953 to 1954. In addition, the amount of $331,000 for item 3 is required to make payments on existing lock equipment contracts, all of which are scheduled for completion in fiscal year 1952.

JUSTIFICATION FOR RESTORATION

Restoration of the $3,000,000 deleted by the House will save the Federal Government costly suspension or termination costs and permit the construction of the lock and dam to continue on schedule. The lock structure has been under contract since February 1950. Traffic below Nashville will be greatly benefited by the improvement of this portion of the Cumberland River. The construction of the Cheatham Lock and Dam will eliminate three inadequate locks and dams that were built about 45 years ago. All the funds recommended for the Cheatham Lock and Dam in the President's budget could be economically used without detriment to the future adaptation of the project to include power, as proposed

in legislation now pending before the Congress, since the project costs and project design for the left abutment of the dam already adequately provide for the addition of power facilities whenever such facilities are authorized and appropriated for by the Congress. Although the construction of the dam proper is not scheduled to start until April 1952, an orderly construction schedule for the lock and dam is necessary to meet the closure date and effectuate a realization of the large navigation benefits which will accrue upon completion of the project.

Item No. 36 (p. 148) Old Hickory Lock and Dam, Tenn.

Total estimated Federal cost	$49,120,000
Allotments to date	450,000
Additional to complete	48,670,000
Approved budget estimate	8,000,000
Amount allowed by House	
Restoration requested	8,000,000

EFFECT OF REDUCTION

Elimination of the fiscal year 1952 funds for this project will not allow construction to get under way and therefore will delay the first power generation from March 1954, as presently scheduled, to June 1955 or possibly longer, depending upon the time and rate at which appropriations are made available.

JUSTIFICATION FOR RESTORATION

The power demands of the TVA system, into which Old Hickory power would be fed, is rapidly expanding due to the accelerated atomic energy program at Oak Ridge and elsewhere in this general region, the Arnold Engineering Air Development Center, and industrial plants engaged in war effort. To meet national security requirements, new power sources must be developed. The TVA has emphasized, in their recent report to the President on the Cumberland River, the need for the immediate construction of Old Hickory, stating that it should be completed as rapidly as possible. TVA has advised that it expects an increase in demand during 1953 of at least 650,000 kilowatts and 600,000 kilowatts in 1954 within their power distribution area. TVA has stated that installation of new generating capacities being projected, "including assumed installation of the third Dale Hollow unit in the fall of 1953 and the installation of 75,000 kilowatts in the Cumberland Basin in calendar year 1954 through construction of Old Hickory project or otherwise, will leave margins of only 3 percent of assured capacities over estimated peak requirements." Similar assertions concerning the power deficiencies in the area to be served by this project have been received from the Southeastern Power Administration of the Department of the Interior and from the Federal Power Commission. The dates for power production scheduled for this project were set up to provide as much hydroelectric power as possible to meet the power requirements of this region. Since use is made of a natural resource (water), the power plant can be operated and maintained without fuel and with less manpower, thus conserving these resources for alternate use in the defense program.

Due to the extended period of time required in the manufacture of the turbines, generators, and transformers, and in order to carry the construction of the structures to a point where this equipment can be installed when delivered, it is essential that construction of the project be undertaken immediately with a minimum of $8,000,000 if this important block of power is to be added to the system by 1954, as scheduled on the basis of the needs described above. Plans and specifications have been completed for the lock and dam and a contract for the initiation of construction can be awarded as soon as funds are appropriated.

JUSTIFICATION FOR RESTORATION—FLOOD CONTROL, GENERAL

Item No. 33 (p. 298). Gavins Point Reservoir, Nebr. and S. Dak.

Total estimated Federal cost	$44,900,000
Allotments to date	668,800
Additional to complete	44,231,200
Approved budget estimate	5,000,000
Amount allowed by House	
Restoration requested	5,000,000

EFFECT OF REDUCTION

Item 1. Preliminary work

Elimination of available funds for this phase (planning and foundation exploration) will stop the preparation of plans for starting actual construction and delay the eventual start of active construction work even longer than the period of suspension, due to lack of continuity. The Gavins Point structures will be founded on shale, thus requiring thorough design studies if the most economical structure is to be built.

Item 2. Land acquisition

Without funds land at the dam site and for the access roads cannot be acquired, thus preventing a start of construction operations.

Items 3 and 4. South access road and access railroad

Neither an improved road nor railroad are available for access to the remote Gavins Point site. Elimination of construction funds for these items will not permit construction of access facilities necessary to starting actual construction of the dam.

Items 5 and 6. Administrative and housing facilities

Office, garage, and housing facilities are in short supply in the vicinity of the dam site. Without funds to construct these facilities, administration of construction would be seriously hampered.

Item 7. Spillway excavation

This is the first logical item of actual construction for the Gavins Point Dam. Lack of funds for this item would prevent the start of fruitful construction work and delay the date of the beneficial returns from the finished project for a period at least equal to the postponement.

The elimination of funds for the Gavins Point project will delay closure 1 year and consequently delay the valuable reregulation effect on Fort Randall operations and the delivery of power from Gavins Point power plant.

JUSTIFICATION FOR RESTORATION

The fiscal year 1952 budget estimate for Gavins Point provides for initiation of construction of this project on a schedule coordinated with that of other interrelated Missouri River projects. Construction should proceed on this schedule for over-all efficiency and effectiveness and to avoid serious disruption of the whole system program. The construction schedule for Gavins Point is closely matched to schedules for Fort Randall, the Federal power transmission and load contracting programs, and power consumers programs for obtaining power needed to supply load requirements of the immediate future in this area. The importance of Gavins Point can be illustrated most directly by its relationship to Fort Randall. Reregulation of Fort Randall power peaking releases by Gavins Point will permit Fort Randall to develop its full power capacity value. The gain at Fort Randall in dependable capacity (firm capability) value over the value from releases curtailed as they would need to be without Gavins Point, is estimated at about $4,800,000 a year. Delay in completion of Gavins Point for such reregulation, which would result from failure to initiate construction in fiscal year 1952, would correspondingly delay this realization of the full power value from the investment at Fort Randall. In addition to this loss, and corresponding losses through falling out of phase with transmission and other power schedules, the delay in completion of Gavins Point would result in the loss for a year or longer of about 500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy and 100,000 kilowatts of generating capacity at the project itself which will be useful to serve area loads and is important for defense. Also the delay in initiation of construction beyond 1952 would result in loss of the flood-control protection to downstream areas and other project benefits for at least 1 year.

It is essential that the full amount of the budget estimate be provided to avoid the delay and serious disruption of the program in addition to the monetary loss of power revenue and other benefits.

Item No. 37 (p. 308). Mount Morris Reservoir, N. Y.

Total estimated Federal cost	$25,250,000
Allotment to date	18,936,600
Additional to complete	6,313,400
Approved budget estimate	5,131,400
Amount allowed by House	4,500,000
Restoration requested	631,400

EFFECT OF REDUCTION

Item H–2. Construction of dam

Delay in placing of mass concrete in dam will require use of heavy construction equipment for another working season. Because of weather conditions in the area where the Mount Morris project is being constructed, the working season is short. If sufficient funds are not provided to permit scheduled progress on the dam, it will be necessary to tie up about $2,500,000 of heavy construction equipment for an additional period of 8 months.

JUSTIFICATION FOR RESTORATION

The type of foundation on which Mount Morris Dam is constructed requires that river work monolith be carried ahead of the abutment monolith. This means that any time work is curtailed, the abutments are lower than the riverward section. During high water periods, which might top the dam, water will flow over the abutment section with possibility of scour of the shale of the abutment roof endangering the stability of the dam. In the event that large floods should occur the possibility of scour would be changed to actual scour which could be serious enough to cause failure of the dam.

The present water line serving the village of Mount Morris and surrounding territory, including the State tuberculosis hospital and a large canning plant which takes the produce from a large area of Genesee Valley, crosses the Genesee River above the dam by coming down the valley. It is planned to relocate the pipeline through the upper gallery of the dam as soon as the gallery is completed. Incompleted condition of the abutment, due to reduced funds, will make it impossible to install the water line. Flooding of the reservoir will endanger the existing water line with high probability of a broken line menacing both health and fire conditions.

Restoration of the budget estimate is essential to permit scheduled progress on the dam to avoid the serious results outlined above.

Item No. 53 (p. 375), Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak.

Total estimated Federal cost	$245,900,000
Allotments to date	9,600,000
Additional to complete	236,300,000
Approved budget estimate	3,770,000
Amount allowed by House	----------
Restoration requested	3,770,000

EFFECT OF REDUCTION

Item 3. Hospital facilities

The Government has a contract obligation to pay the Benedictine Convent of the Sacred Heart an annual sum of $17,500 for providing hospital facilities for the Oahe project workers. With complete elimination of 1952 funds, construction work would cease. Hospital facilities would not be required and payments would be suspended for the period of no construction activity. Suspension of funds for this item would be an injustice to the organization which is expanding its facilities to care for project needs.

Items 10 and 11. Earthwork stage I and IA

The elimination of funds for this item will require that the continuing contract for earthwork be terminated at 70 percent of completion. The excavation work under this item is planned to open the upstream portals of the diversion tunnels to permit the start of tunnel construction. Delay therefore of the stage I work will delay the time of completion of the diversion tunnels by an equal

amount. The contractor for earthwork stage I and IA will undoubtedly claim damages because of the termination action.

Item 12. Earthwork stage II

This item is the next logical step in earthwork operations at Oahe and is planned to advance construction of the downstream end of the diversion works. It is planned to advertise this item about September 1951. Elimination of funds for Oahe for 1952 will cause postponement of advertising this item until funds are again available. Delay in earthwork for the diversion works will cause an equal postponement of diversion and ultimately ineffective use of the project.

Item 13. Sheetpile cut-off

Elimination of funds for 1952 to support this continuing contract will require that the contract be terminated at 60-percent completion. The contractor will undoubtedly claim damages because of termination action. The sheetpile cut-off work must be closely coordinated with earthwork stage II. A new contract to complete the terminated work would be required when funds are again available, consequently critical steel piling must be reordered and delivery awaited before field work can begin. Since this work is a necessary preliminary to stage II earthwork it is likely that additional delays in starting the stage II earthwork would result beyond the delay caused directly by lack of funds.

Item 21. Land acquisition

Elimination of funds for this item will not permit acquisition of land for the next phases of construction. An orderly land acquisition program is essential to orderly progress of construction.

Item 22. Planning

Elimination of funds for this item will cause a complete suspension of planning and design work and in the important foundation exploration program. Continuity of planning is necessary for efficiency; its lack will result in a delay in completing the project, longer than the period of actual suspension of planning work.

Item 23. Stock, equipment, etc.

This item is essential to townsite operations. Funds are therefore required if activities at Oahe are to be properly administered in the field.

Elimination of 1952 funds for Oahe construction will cause a complete shut-down of construction work and a delay of final completion of the project at least equal to the period of shut-down. Oahe has progressed to the point where major construction operations can be conducted on an efficient basis. The plans for the next stage of earthwork are about complete; ready for advertisement. Experienced supervisory and inspection forces are mobilized at Pierre. Housing has been constructed for those forces. Contractors are at work. School and hospital facilities are being expanded to care for project needs. Operation of many of the features of mobilization cannot be suspended and later reactivated without additional delay to actual construction operations. An additional mobilization for construction will be costly. The value of continuous planning will be lost. Oahe Reservoir has a large and important capacity for storage of silt, a feature not so abundantly available at Fort Randall. With postponement of Oahe, silting at Fort Randall would occur during an additional period equal to the postponement.

JUSTIFICATION FOR RESTORATION

Restoration of the funds requested for Oahe would have the following valuable effects:

1. Avoid delay in the realization of downstream flood-control benefits.
2. Avoid the loss of the large amount of power which could otherwise be produced at Oahe (upon completion) during a period equal to the length of the shut-down.
3. Avoid the loss of a large amount of power at Garrison due to lower heads which will result from the larger amount of storage which will need to be reserved for flood control at Garrison until storage is available at Oahe.
4. Avoid the loss of a large amount of power at Fort Randall due to lower heads which will result from the larger amount of storage which must be reserved for a flood control at Fort Randall prior to the construction of Oahe.
5. Shorten the period of exposure of the smaller Fort Randall Reservoir to the high rate of sedimentation which will prevail there prior to the closure of Oahe.

6. Preserve the benefits of the existing mobilization at Oahe; that is, avoid the cost of demobilization and the subsequent costs and difficulties of remobilization.
7. Permit initial construction features already under construction to be completed.
8. Permit necessary planning to be advanced and construction of the next logical portions of the work to be initiated.

In order to sustain the above potential advantages and to make available the ultimate benefits of the project at the earliest date, it would be prudent to restore all the funds for Oahe recommended in the President's budget.

Fire Island Inlet, N. Y.

Total estimated Federal cost	$822,000
Allotments to date	594,000
Amount that could be expended during fiscal year 1952	228,000

Appropriation.—None in fiscal year 1951 or 1952.

Authorization.—1950 and prior River and Harbor Acts.

Location and Description.—Fire Island Inlet lies about 50 miles, by water, southeast of the Battery, New York City on the south shore of Long Island, N. Y. and connects the Atlantic Ocean and Great South Bay. The authorized modification of the existing project, contained in House Document No. 762, Eightieth Congress, second session, provides for a channel 14 feet long and 250 feet wide through Fire Island Inlet, connecting the Atlantic Ocean and Great South Bay.

Status.—Work completed consists of the construction of a jetty extending generally southwest and south for a length of 5,000 feet from high ground on Democrat Point at the west end of Fire Island.

Proposed Operations.—With an expenditure of $228,000, the dredging of the 14-foot channel could be completed during the 1952 fiscal year.

Justification.—The authorized project provides for an adequate and safe channel through Fire Island Inlet that would be of material benefit to commercial fishing, recreational boating and fishing, and result in the resumption of waterborne traffic in petroleum products, now prevented by the shoal condition in the inlet. Principal commerce of Fire Island Inlet include shellfish, fresh or frozen fish, authracite coal, crushed stone, petroleum products and riprap. Benefit to cost ratio is 2.68. Controlling depth in January 1947 was 5.7 feet at mean low water.

Colorado River to Bay City, Tex.

Total estimated Federal cost	$786,000
Allotments to date (planning)	30,000
Amount that could be expended during fiscal year 1952	756,000

Appropriation for 1951.—None.

Authorization.—1938 River and Harbor Act.

The 1938 River and Harbor Act authorized the modification of the project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to provide a channel in the Colorado River 9-feet deep and 100-feet wide from the mouth to a point 17 miles upstream in the vicinity of Bay City, Tex. No construction funds have been made available for work in this feeder tributary to the main Gulf Waterway. Funds in the amount of $756,000 could be appplied during fiscal year 1952 for completion of the project.

This channel will serve as a useful feeder to the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, will provide a water outlet for the agricultural and petroleum products in the Bay City area, and will provide barge transportation for mud shell for road construction along the lower reaches of the river. Development of adjacent oil fields, sulfur mines, and shipping of farm products will assure additional tonnage when the channel is opened for barge traffic.

Jones Inlet, New York

Total estimated Federal cost	$1,210,000
Allotments to date	None
Amount that could be expended during fiscal year 1952	600,000

Authorization.—1945 River and Harbor Act.

Location and Description.—Jones Inlet is located about 37 miles southeast of the Battery, New York City, on the south shore of Long Island. The authorized

project, as contained in House Document No. 409, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, provides for an entrance jetty and a channel 12 feet deep, 250 feet wide, from that depth in the ocean, through the inlet to the Loop Causeway Bridge over Long Creek, provided that local interests contribute 50 per cent of the first cost ($1,210,000) and also provide a channel 12 feet deep at mean low water and generally 200 feet wide from the Loop Causeway Bridge over Long Creek to the head of navigation in Freeport Creek at Mill Road in Freeport.

Status.—No work has been done on this project.

Proposed Operations.—With a Federal expenditure of $600,000 and an equal amount by local interests, the construction work could be initiated in the fiscal year 1952.

Justification.—Jones Inlet is normally used by commercial-fishing vessels, sports-fishing vessels, and private pleasure craft. The principal difficulties attending navigation at Jones Inlet are insufficient depth, the unstable condition of the channel caused by shifting sands, and excessive shoaling at the mouth of Long Creek, which blocks the entrance to that waterway. Local interests have spent large sums for the creation of channels and anchorage basins within the inner bays. Construction of an east jetty would reduce the erosion of Point Lookout, and prevent the destruction of valuable property.

Guadalupe River, Channel to Victoria, Texas

Total estimated Federal cost	$13,137,000
Allotments to date (for planning)	195,000
Amount that could be profitably expended during fiscal year 1952	380,000
Amount required to complete	12,562,000
1951 appropriation	15,000

Authorization.—1945 River and Harbor Act.

Location and Description.—The project consists of a navigation channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide, from a point on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, about 138 miles west of Galveston, Tex., along the east shore of San Antonio, Guadalupe, and Mission Bays, and the Guadalupe River to a point 3 miles above Victoria, Tex.

Status.—Work done to date consists of advance planning.

The sum of $380,000 could be profitably expended during fiscal year 1952 in dredging a channel from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in San Antonio Bay to the vicinity of Seadrift, Tex. Completion of this section of the waterway will make available a useful increment of the authorized project for prospective commerce and the establishment of proposed industrial activities.

Justification.—No water-borne freight movement has been reported on the existing project since 1934. Prospective traffic totals 634,000 tons inbound and outbound including crude oil, sand and gravel, cotton, scrap iron, gasoline, lubricating oil, phosphate rock, industrial chemicals, and miscellaneous other items. Transportation savings are estimated at about $330,000. In addition, about 16,000 acres of bottom land would be protected from flooding by a levee to be constructed on the riverside of the canal, and drainage of this land would be greatly improved. Benefits from this feature of the project are estimated at $110,000. Several industries have indicated an interest in building plants in the area, subject to a guaranty of construction of the project. The E. I. du Pont de Nemours has constructed a large chemical plant located adjacent to the proposed route of the channel about 10 miles below Victoria, Tex.

Corning, N. Y.

Total estimated Federal cost	$4,740,000
Allotments to date	2,160,000
Tentative allocation fiscal year 1952	925,000
Additional to complete after fiscal year 1952	1,655,000

1951 Appropriation.—None.

Authorization.—1936 and 1950 Flood Control Acts.

Location and description.—At Corning, Steuben County, N. Y., which is situated on the Chemung River 2 miles downstream from the confluence of the Tioga and Cohocton Rivers. The completed portion of the project consists of levees and walls along the Chemung and Cohocton Rivers and along Post and Cutler Creeks with channel improvement work on Cutler Creek. The remaining work is a conduit and flume along Monkey Run. Monkey Run traverses that portion of the

city which is located along the right bank, discharging into the river between the New York Central Railroad and Pine Street highway bridges. The lower portion of the stream flows through a 7-foot diameter brick conduit which passes under the Corning Glass Works and through a flood wall constructed by the Government for protection of the city from floods in the Chemung River. The proposed improvement consists of a combination of an open flume and a conduit commencing upstream from Sixth Street and discharging into the river at a point immediately downstream from the Pine Street bridge. The project will also include the installation of storm sewers and construction of a pumping station

	Linear feet
Length of levee (completed)	42,910
Length of wall (completed)	3,300
Length of conduit	2,280
Length of flume	1,870

Scheduled completion date: October 1954.

Operations—

Item	Total cost	Allocations			
		Through 1950	Fiscal year 1951	Fiscal year 1952	After fiscal year 1952
Completed work	$2,160,000	$2,160,000			
Design and plans	240,000			$125,000	$115,000
Flume	700,000				700,000
Conduit	1,430,000			625,000	805,000
Pumping station, miscellaneous work, and storm sewers	210,000			175,000	35,000
Total	4,740,000	2,160,000		925,000	1,655,000
Percentage of completion		45	45	65	

Justification.—The remaining work is that required along Monkey Run and is an extension of the existing protective system at Corning. This work is essential to enable the discharge of flood flows in Monkey Run through the existing protected area without damage and to prevent damages from ponding of normal flows during high stages in the Chemung River. It will eliminate the flood hazard to the operations of the Corning Glass Works, the principal industry in the city. The Corning Glass Works has been designated as a key industry from the standpoint of national defense and its protection against floods is considered highly important by the Munitions Board and the National Production Authority.

The funds allocated for operations in fiscal year 1952 would be utilized to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction by continuing contract of the first unit of the project which would include the conduit from the river to its upper end at a point between Second and Third Streets and construction of a pumping station and miscellaneous appurtenant work. Expenditure of the funds proposed would result in completion of approximately 30 percent of the work on Monkey Run and afford a substantial portion of the contemplated protection. The amount allocated for operations in fiscal year 1952 is the minimum which will permit economical coordination of construction.

(Whereupon, at 4:05 p. m., Tuesday, July 17, 1951, the hearing was recessed until 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, July 18, 1951.)